

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLII.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

BY EX-SPEAKER REED.

IT IS a very unfortunate thing for the country that the Democratic party, in its inexperience of responsibilities, should continue its custom, born of thirty years' of exile, of charging to the Republican party all the things which happen. It would seem as if the people could do nothing to fix responsibilities. Not even a three-to-one majority in the House can confer upon these partisans any freedom from the idea that all things that are done are still done by the Republicans. Even the visible presence of a majority of 145, almost twice as large as the whole Republican force, has not prevented the New England Democrat from charging the non-repeal of the act, called the Sherman act, to his party enemies in the House. They do this even at the time when the commonest dictates of good sense demand that they should behave with a little decency towards opponents whose help they are asking. It is most unfortunate that the difficulties of this country should be made more afflictive by attempts to make party capital, when the real wealth of the country is in jeopardy. If the Sherman act has not proved a remedy for the situation of 1890, or rather having been the solution of the impending questions of that perplexing time, has ceased to be for the good of the coun-

VOL. CLVII.—NO. 442.

17

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

try, why not examine it in the light of all the conditions and try to find out what ought to be done? Why spend time in being extra-wise after an event, when the real question is of being moderately-wise at the present time? The one fact that John Sherman deemed the act of 1890 the wisest act which could be passed in 1890 is an important and controlling fact. It is of course not wonderful that men of utterly unknown names criticise Mr. Sherman's action. Men with unknown names attacked the public virtue of George Washington and taught finance to Alexander Hamilton. But the plain people must remember that in finance the great historic figure of our day is John Sherman of Ohio. To his steadfastness more than to the steadfastness of any other man do we owe the resumption of specie payments, that great financial act of the century. While Mr. Sherman was arranging the terms of the act of 1890 the very men who now confuse the issue by blame of him either applauded or assumed the indifference of irresponsibility. What we ought to be having now is not discussion of the causes of the Sherman act, but discussions as to the causes of the present condition of affairs. It matters as little to charge one party with passing the act, as it does to charge the other party with such vehement championship of free silver and such combination with its advocates as necessitated the compromise which is now complained of.

Another misfortune to the country is the attempt, also in the interest of partisanship, to saddle upon this one act all the events which are now in the process of happening. Just ask yourselves for a moment what ought to be the effect of the possession of the country from top to bottom by a party made up of the slowly gathered opposition of thirty years after a successful fight on a platform which demands Free Trade and State Banks and in general a complete reversal of the national policy of three decades. Let us suppose further that the victory was not a decision on the merits carefully matured and gradually approached, but the result of vague undefined dissatisfaction with a hundred things. Add to this the other fact, sometimes forgotten, that the leaders of the new occupation of the legislative halls were known free silver men, whose clamorous demand for unlimited coinage made any limitation seem a harbor of refuge only three years ago. Let it be further supposed that the only hope of reforming these gentlemen by a virtuous President, su-

perior to his party, was in the distribution of Federal patronage on that system of merit which regards a congressional vote as unassailable by money, but open to the proper distribution of office. With all this before the country what in the world would a sensible man expect? Would he expect that business would run smoothly with its finances in the hands of men who have adopted every vagary of currency that has ever been promulgated? Would he expect that manufacturers would calmly go on manufacturing goods when changes in the tariff might convert the storehouse of product into a magazine of disaster? Would he suppose that manufacturers would put stock into their mills to be worked into cloth which could be undersold? Would not the sensible man do just what he is doing—curtail his manufactures and diminish his business. If he would not of himself, the banks would soon teach him the lesson. Diminished credits and the hoarding of bank notes by scared citizens would soon cut off his resources.

Do not let this picture be accused of exaggeration or of party bias. Let it be admitted that the Democratic party in office will be better than its declarations out of office. That could easily be true. Everybody knows that responsibility steadies even the most flighty, that a Secretary who voted for free coinage in the Senate may be a sound money man in the Treasury Department, and that the legislator is always wiser than the stump orator. Supposing the Democratic party cannot achieve free trade, and that there are even suspicions that it never meant to do so, even though that doctrine be in the platform with all the power of the most definite human language; platforms are not statutes, and the people still rule, even after election. Make your utmost deduction for the conservatism of office and responsibility; make it also in due measure for the lying nature of platforms and promises, and you yet have the most powerful residuum of distrust ever left to harass a nation.

Perhaps not one-half of the industries of the nation will be attacked. Granted. But which half? and how much? There is the secret of the condition of business affairs to-day. No human being, not even the Democratic party itself, can tell what that party will do; hence, all that business can do is to call a halt. I am aware that any allusion to the tariff, or suggestion that the attitude of the victors towards the tariff is one of the causes at the bottom of

our present distress, will seem, to the unthinking, to show a disposition to call up party questions, and to renew an old and threadbare discussion. But such is by no means the fact. Whether free trade be right or wrong, whether protection be a sound system or a base and inexcusable tax on the poor, makes no difference whatever as to the bearing of the question upon our present condition. The Democratic party has come into power under solemn pledge, put into the amplest language, to abolish protection. Now, it so happens that the greater part of the business of this country for the last thirty years has been based upon protection. Men have differed as to the degree of protection, acts and amendments have varied the schedules, but protection has been the ruling thought and the ruling practice in this country for thirty years.

The Democratic party has, by a large majority, in convention assembled rejected any compromise, and ordered the system of protection to the rear. The house we have lived in for thirty years has been ordered to be demolished. Is there any wonder that there is commotion, that everybody is moving out his furniture and having his baggage strapped? To add to the confusion, the President announced in his inaugural that due attack would also be made on those aggregations of capital which the progress of modern business has united under the influence of competition and the demand for cheaper prices. Whether such an announcement was a patriotic one or not is not, in the least, in question. If a system is in the process of establishment by the natural course of business, and all kinds of business are adopting it, such a declaration by the Executive, even if made without full consideration or definite purpose, could produce only one result. Another element of distrust was thereby visibly introduced. It is true that a great Democratic newspaper demanded of the Attorney-General action against these corporations by name, and it is equally true that the Attorney-General maintained a dogged silence. If the Democratic newspaper did not know the difference between an inaugural and legal proceedings, the Attorney-General did. Nevertheless, all this added to the general confusion and made its mark and did its work at a time when no one dreamed of the widespread demoralization which was to follow. Clamors of this kind might have had their uses if they could have been confined in their effects to the objects aimed at. But nobody knows

what point an avalanche, once started, will reach. Where our avalanche, started in November of last year, will go, we do not yet know.

Let us look, also, a little bit into that future which we hope the present state of affairs has discounted. It is one of the great good fortunes of the human race that the future can be anticipated, even if it be in disaster and sorrow. This country ought now to be at its lowest ebb of misfortune. If wise measures are adopted, it must from now grow into better condition. But there must be wise measures, and in order to have wise measures taken we must know what is the matter with us. It will not do, under the guise of rising above party, to ignore the questions which have been for years agitating this country. Why have these questions been before the people? Surely, because they vitally concern the people. Therefore, any attempt to state this case and leave out the vital question would be as silly as to talk about a dying man's complexion and ignore the gaping wound.

All the periods of depression which we have had since 1873 have been short-lived and have involved the people but very little. Rich men have lost and won, but work has been abundant, banks have remained sound and savings-banks have been unassailed. Now it is far otherwise. Banks in great numbers with large aggregate capital have failed. Weeks ago they numbered three hundred and the total capital was between thirty and forty millions. The Comptroller of the Currency hastened to say that only one hundred of these were national banks, a tribute to the stability of national banks which is doubly grateful from Democratic sources, for it shows that the election of last year may have one good result, and that is the conversion into friends of some of the enemies of our minor institutions. But the disaster has not been confined to the dealers in money. The dealers in merchandise and labor are equally affected. Mills are stopping all over the country. This is very serious. When the Amoskeag Mills, in Manchester, ceased to run they ceased also to afford sustenance to 3,000 operatives. When 3,000 operatives cease to have wages they cease to spend wages, and when they cease to spend wages the shop-keeper ceases to buy the things the operatives used to purchase, and the manufacturer ceases to make just so many goods and his workmen go on short wages or he shuts down. What can the mills do but shut down? The object of running

mills is to make money. Sometimes, however, mills run without making money for the moment for reasons connected with the making of money in the future. Mill owners dislike to shut down for any length of time because it breaks up their organization. With each man in his proper place and all understanding each other and working together the best results come about, and the largest output for the least expenditure can be had. Naturally, therefore, the mill is reluctant to shut down. It would much rather slow down, or even go on at a slight loss. This it can do when the prospect ahead shows favorably, and the difficulty then existing seems only temporary, and the return of favorable conditions is seen in the near future. But the situation now is far different. What the future will be no one knows. It is true that the Democratic platform declares for free trade pure and simple, and denounces as robbery the system now in use in the country. It is equally true that Mr. Watterson, in Kentucky, and Governor Stone, in Missouri, are clamoring for the fulfilment of the promises thus definitely given to the country generally, and to them specially. They and their friends demand that no financial question shall keep them from the just rewards of their toil and victory. On the face of it, they seem to have right on their side. The platform devised by Mr. Watterson, or at least vigorously engineered by him, is all that free trade could demand or foreign producers desire. It was passed by an overwhelming majority, and Mr. Watterson may well argue that if anything Democratic was approved by the people, that was. Nevertheless, it would be wild to claim that the Democratic platform, in its full amplitude of meaning, will ever become law. Democratic platforms never do. They are not made for that purpose. There are also many Democratic States like Connecticut, to which the tariff is vital. The race of Democrats like the late Hon. Samuel J. Randall, though for the moment driven out of sight by the pressure of the Southern Democracy, is not yet dead and will show itself in the present exigency, backed up by many business Democrats who realize what free trade would be for this country. Moreover, some of those who have been using language which meant free trade are appalled by the darkness of the shadow now upon them, and are endeavoring to mitigate the results of the blows of their own bludgeons. I saw the other day in one of those newspapers which are too good to

be Republican, and not good enough to be Democratic, a long editorial showing how tariff reform could be drawn so mild that it would hurt nobody. Then realizing that that would not be comforting to the rabid free trade brother the editorial soothed him with the hope of amputating another finger next year, and perhaps a leg next Congress. Nevertheless, giving all the heed you can to the change of sentiment thus manifested, giving all the weight you can to the plain impossibility of Free Trade as Henry Watterson wants it, you yet have left in all its disturbing force the impending change in the system established thirty years ago, under which this country has had unexampled prosperity. Next to the fact that a change of some sort is to be made, the worst thing is that the change is to be made by the enemies of the system. If they cannot destroy it they will do their best to mangle. Already the air is thick with that class of reformers whose business education is mostly confined to their tongues, and who openly avow that their new tariff will lead to great importations the first year and still greater in the future, that our supplies will be manufactured abroad, while our workmen stand idle at home. Nevertheless, baleful as the influence of these gentlemen will be, it is not to be expected that they will be entirely in control. However much the administration may endeavor to take out of the hands of the inexperienced Democratic members of Congress the making of the tariff, one would have to despair of free institutions if he did not believe that the people would make themselves heard and felt on this subject, so vital to their interest and business success.

But after you have made all the deductions you can make from the demands of the Democratic platform; after you have made all the allowances you can make for change of heart resulting from the "object lesson," and all the changes which will result from the effect of the action of business men or their representatives, there still remains the great cause of the present depression and the disasters which are to follow. The great cause of the present depression is that nobody knows what will happen to the business interests of the country. Not even the Democrats of the highest caste know. From one end of the country to the other there is only ignorance of the future and distrust.

Even if you grant that the demand of Watterson and other earnest men that the party shall stand by its pledges, shall carry

out the platform adopted after full discussion by so great a majority, will never be acceded to, however resonant and vociferous the Kentucky statesman may be, there yet remains the fact that nobody knows how much he and his followers may do. In other words, the manufacturers of this country do not know what is going to happen to them. Nothing but uncertainty is their lot, and uncertainty is the great paralyzer of business. Nothing the Democratic party can do is half so bad as the state of not knowing what they are going to do. No manufacturer can know whether it is safe to buy his raw material. Every manufacturer knows that it is unsafe for him to manufacture beyond his orders. The manufacturer also knows that he has got to deal anew with the question of the price of labor. Labor is the prime element of cost in most manufactures. The price of labor has steadily gone up until a year ago it was higher than ever before. If the manufacturer's goods are to come into competition mainly with the goods of other manufacturers of this country, then the wages of this country may be safely maintained; but if the goods are to compete with those goods which are made where the price of labor is much less, then there must be a readjustment of the price of labor here or the manufacture must cease. This is another reason for shutting down mills; for the question of labor can better be readjusted from a closed mill than from one running. This uncertainty of the price of labor is the worst element in our unfortunate situation and the one which will create the most distress and unhappiness. Men and women measure the happiness of each moment by the happiness which has been meted out to them in the past, and while no change is probable that will relegate the laboring man back to where he was in 1860, or make him endure more than his father did, yet he will miss many a luxury, become almost a necessity, before he gets out of the troubles resulting from the elections of 1892. It would have been better to let well enough alone. This prophecy as to the result of the present condition of things upon wages is not mine. It belongs to the *Evening Post*, a journal which has always fairly admitted both the increase of wages since 1860, and the decrease of the prices of commodities, and which now prophesies what seems inevitable—a reduction of wages of skilled and unskilled labor.

The fact of the attitude of the party in power towards the

tariff is one which was persistently ignored at the commencement of this downfall of prices. All sorts of events had prominence, but never that. People have almost forgotten that we were in great agitation because the gold in the treasury had got below the \$100,000,000 mark. "No free gold in the treasury" was then the cry. To-day that is entirely forgotten. No newspaper even publishes the item except in its place with the rest of the treasury exhibit. Doubtless the issue of bonds and the assurance that all moneys of the government should be kept on a level would have done us good and lessened a little the swiftness of the fall, but it would have been only a palliative. So, too, with the Sherman Act so called. Unquestionably our financial situation is not a good one, but the greatest misfortune connected with it has been the determination of the Democratic party to fasten upon that act all the misfortunes of the entire situation. The clamor made over that has so filled our ears that we seem incapable of hearing more important sounds. This is said without the slightest sense or feeling that the Republican party will be better or worse for having aided to pass that law, or that the law is either better or worse from having been passed by a Republican Congress. It was passed in obedience to the logic of the state of affairs then existing. The silver men had been at work and their opponents had been idle. Mr. Cleveland's attack on silver eight years ago and the failure of all his prophecies had discredited the opposition to silver coinage very greatly. The entire Democratic party in the Senate with only two or three exceptions, and these exceptions did not include the present Secretary of the Treasury, voted for free coinage of silver. Every Democratic leader, including the present Speaker, Mr. Crisp, including Mr. Mills and Mr. Springer, with Judge Holman and all the rest, was loudly for free coinage of silver. They left no stone unturned in their endeavors. In all the preliminary stages, but one Democrat, Mr. Tracy, of New York, refused to vote with his leaders. After the fight was over the Northern Democracy and the Southern Democracy both voted together against the compromise. Had the Northern Democracy then and there done their duty by their country instead of trying to make party capital there would have been a different story to tell to-day. Nevertheless, this is all ancient history, recurred to only because no misrepresentation ought to go uncontradicted which seems still liable to mislead honest people.

But we are not only in bad shape on account of the silver act, but there are threatening dangers of a financial as well as economical character from the Democratic possession of power. Their platform contains a positive promise to repeal the tax on State Bank circulation. To repeal the Silver Act of 1890 and put in the place of National Banks a set of State Banks would be a wretched substitution. New York might thrive and the money changers generally ; but this country at large would be pretty badly off. One result of the war, which all judicious persons were rejoicing over, was a national currency which was interrupted in its flow by no State boundaries and subject to no local vicissitudes. With a country growing more compact by the aid of railroads and telegraphs and with business disregarding more and more every day all barriers of State lines a system of finance the same for all has become more and more a necessity. To return again to local banks unregulated by central authority and to securities which have no standing at the great money centres is probably impossible and yet the Democratic party is thereunto solemnly pledged, and there is great reason to fear that that pledge, if impossible of liberal fulfilment, may be a lever by which any victory for sound money may be twisted into a virtual defeat.

We have now to face whatever is before us and prepare for the future. If our efforts now should result in a system of banking and currency which would divorce the monetary system of this country from the politics of parties, what we have suffered for the last four months might not be too high a price to pay for it.

The danger to which our present system exposes us is well illustrated by our recent history. The President, from motives which are not to be questioned, urged upon the last Congress the repeal of the purchase clause as the one paramount duty. He sent agents to Washington for that purpose. All this was well known and was calculated to call the attention of foreigners in a most emphatic manner to the questions raised. When distrust began to manifest itself the party newspapers began with one accord for party purposes to put the whole blame on that act. Of that act there was but little defence on the other side, because, having been but a makeshift, it had never been approved except as a temporary action. Hence this issue has obscured all others. When it has been disposed of, and the whole country

hopes it will be, even before this article gets into print, the other questions which have been alluded to already will take their proper position of importance before the community.

It has seemed to me proper to call attention to these matters now because the people must soon be face to face with them. If I have not dwelt at length upon the repeal of the purchase clause it is because of the hope that the special session of Congress will have, one way or the other, disposed of that issue before this article appears. When that is disposed of we must in like manner dispose of the uncertainties of our banking system, our currency, and our economic basis of living. In order to do that satisfactorily we must have a vigorous participation on the part of the people. Let no individual believe that at the last election he finished his duty to his country. If every man still continues to exert upon those who represent him his full measure of influence, even a victorious party may be made to refrain from deeds which the awakened sense of the people deems would be injurious to the country.

THOMAS B. REED.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE IN SIAM.

I.—AN ENGLISH VIEW.

BY THE HON. GEORGE N. CURZON, M. P., LATELY BRITISH
UNDER SECRETARY FOR INDIA.

THE editor of this REVIEW has asked me to summarize for the benefit of his readers the why and wherefore of the trouble in Siam with which the columns of the newspapers have lately been filled. I returned to England myself from Bangkok only in March last, having previously travelled through the French dominions of Indo-China. Already the storm was brewing; and one needed no particular command of political meteorology to foresee that it soon must burst. The information which I had obtained from both parties in the impending dispute, the French and the Siamese, has induced me to follow its progress with peculiar interest, and not perhaps without some appreciation of the views of both combatants. I will also explain the point at which British interests become involved, and the bearing of the issue upon the fortunes both of British commerce and empire.

In its larger aspect the imbroglio has illustrated no more uncommon phenomenon than the impingement upon a somewhat feeble Asiatic state of the masterful and expanding force of a first-rate European power. It is the experience of history that where a petty Oriental dominion, whose borders are not precisely defined and which does not exercise a firm grip upon the confines of its jurisdiction, comes into contact with the more highly-organized civilizations and the military systems of the West, frontier disputes arise, claims upon doubtful territory are made and contested, and the tendency of the stronger power is to advance at the expense of the weaker. There are two methods, however, by which this result can be attained. The

first is by diplomatic agreement or pressure, or through the intermediate form of some sort of protectorate. The second is by forcible seizure and aggression ; and it is from the fact that the French have in this case deliberately adopted the latter method that the dramatic interest of the conflict has arisen, and that the ethics of their action have been so generally impugned.

It is only thirty years since the French, reviving the dream which throughout this century had never entirely faded from their imaginations, of a French Asiatic Empire that should both plant their eagles in a continent where they had once come so near to greatness, and should balance the ever-swelling significance of the British Empire in Hindustan, established themselves upon the eastern confines of the Indo-Chinese peninsula, in the dominions, once subordinate to China, but latterly enjoying a precarious and tottering independence, of the Emperor of Annam. Between the years 1860 and 1885 Cochin China, Cambodia, Annam proper, and Tongking were successively attacked, and either partially swallowed or completely absorbed. On the land side, however, of these possessions, and on the middle and upper courses of the great Mekong River, whose lower channel and delta were now in French territory, lay the still independent kingdom of Siam. The desire to possess this great river basin, and thereby to divert to French counters the trade of the Laos states through which it flows and, ultimately, the still undeveloped commerce of the populous provinces of Southwest China, notably Yunnan, induced the newcomers to send the famous exploring expedition of De Lagrée, Garnier, De Carné and others up the Mekong in 1866-68, and not even the unfavorable report which was made by them upon the navigability of the stream has ever expelled from French brains the political ambitions which these hyperpatriotic and gallant pioneers in their published works did their best to encourage. The doubtful fortunes of French administration in Tongking, which has been consistently bungled from the start, and has suggested the belief that the French genius is inadequate to the task of dealing with conquered Eastern peoples, still further stimulated a desire for the acquisition of fresh military laurels, which the humiliation of the German war had not unnaturally implanted in French bosoms. Siam had the impertinence or the misfortune to stand in the way of these martial ambitions ; and while I was in Tongking last winter, the colonial press, which is

even more Chauvinistic than the Parisian, was engaged in manufacturing causes of possible offence against the predestined enemy, and in clamoring loudly for his subjugation and doom. Claims on behalf of French subjects who were alleged to have been harshly treated by the Siamese Government, or had been expelled from Siamese territory for carrying on political intrigue under the innocent guise of trade, were put forward ; the presence of Siamese military or customs posts in territory that was only separated by a range of mountains from the French Protectorate of Annam was represented as an unwarrantable insult, and when the Siamese Government commenced the execution of a railway in a northeasterly direction from the capital, Bangkok, to the plateau of Korat, with the intention of ultimately prolonging it to the Mekong—a measure which would have insured to all time the westward drift of Laos and Yunnan trade—it was felt by French patriotism that the hour for action had struck. The fact that the elections were impending in France and that a weak Government, called to power by an accident, was in need of some cry upon which to appeal to the electorate, was an additional incentive to a forward policy ; while in the background lurked the comfortable feeling that the power whose Eastern prestige would be the most detrimentally affected by the punishment or detri-
tion of Siam would be the hereditary enemy, England.

Siam, for her part, was not ignorant of what was impending, and sought to make friends with her formidable antagonist while she was in the way with him. The utmost that was known of the immediate French claims was the statement of various French ministers that the minimum of their pretensions was the left bank of the Mekong ; but whether this foreshadowed wholesale territorial appropriation or the creation of a sphere of influence was never explained ; while the sole attempt at justification ever made by a French statesman (and repeated *totidem verbis* in the subsequent *ultimatum*) was the assertion that these claims reposed upon the historical rights of Annam and Cambodia. As against these undefined, undemonstrated and undemonstrable rights, Siam could point to the facts : (1) That the territory in dispute between the Mekong River and the Annamite border mountains had been conquered by her over one hundred years ago, and had been administered by Siamese subject-princes, commissioners, or governors, ever since ; (2) that it was inhabited by

tribes belonging to the Siamese and not the Annamite stock ; (3) that the French maps themselves acknowledged it to be Siamese by their coloring—the famous map of Garnier, the explorer, in particular, first published in 1873 and reissued without alteration in 1885, having drawn the Siamese frontier along the mountain crest, and far to the east of the river ; and (4) that the recent French explorations in those regions, which it now appeared were only the prelude to violent seizure, had only been accomplished by the formal invocation and grant of Siamese aid.

Nevertheless, a feeble State brought face to face with a great power already in a temper of exasperation, and with a mind set on mischief, does well not to rely upon rights alone, however incontestable ; and hence it arose that in the early months of the present year the Siamese Government, anxious to avoid a conflict from which it could not but suffer, but at the same time exhibiting a dignity which has throughout been in striking contrast to the peremptory curtness of its antagonist, successively proposed to the French Minister at Bangkok the retention of the *status quo* pending the examination of rival claims, the *pro tem.* creation of a neutral zone from which both parties should withdraw their posts, the initiation of diplomatic *pourparlers* preliminary to delimitation, and reference to arbitration upon contested points. M. Pavie, the French representative at Bangkok, and a gentleman of great ability and courtesy, was not unwilling to negotiate upon these bases. But such an issue would not have suited either the fire-eaters of the Parisian boulevards, or the colonial filibusters who were already mixing their war paint in Saigon ; and early in April the wires conveyed to the astonished ears of Siam and of Europe the intelligence that French troops were advancing rapidly to seize the territory in dispute.

To such a conflict there could be but one issue. The Siamese detachments, ill equipped and badly officered, could make but little headway against forces led by Europeans and furnished with modern rifles and ammunition. Here and there a brave stand was made, and it is probable that the French, who are unsuited to such warfare, have gained a more expensive and less certain success than their own reports aver. One by one, however, the Siamese posts on the left bank of the Mekong River, on the islands in its channel, and in the strip of territory between the river and the Annamite mountains were expelled, although even as I write

the news of continued fighting shows that the process is not yet complete.

In the course of these engagements, however, a French captain was taken prisoner, and not immediately surrendered, and a French militia inspector was either assassinated or slain. Although in the event of the former of these hypotheses proving correct, the Siamese Government at once offered ample reparation, the opportunity for more decisive action was too good to be lost, and the news reached Europe that the French fleet had been ordered to Bangkok. British susceptibilities were not unnaturally aroused at the danger that was threatened, either by a local outbreak or by foreign bombardment to a city which contains many thousand British subjects, where the principal mercantile houses are British, and where ninety-three per cent. of the import and eighty-five per cent. of the export trade are carried in British vessels. Inquiries in the House of Commons elicited the reply that the news was premature and that the French Government had promised to give to London prior notice of any such movement. A few days later, however, came the surprising intelligence that on July 13 two French gunboats had taken the Siamese by surprise, had forced the ascent of the Menam River, silencing the fire of the Siamese forts, and were anchored in a menacing attitude off the city. Various and conflicting explanations were subsequently given of this proceeding, which, according to the point of view from which it was regarded, appeared either as a regrettable incident or as a wanton outrage. The French premier asserted that his orders to the admiral not to cross the bar had not arrived in time. But it is certain that M. Pavie's instructions to the same effect had duly reached the too impetuous commander, whilst no one could deny that the step was in open violation both of the pledge that had been given to Downing Street, and of the Franco-Siamese Treaty of 1856, by which no French vessels were permitted to ascend the river beyond Paknam at its mouth, without the consent of the Siamese authorities. The well-timed indifference of subordinate officers serving in foreign parts to orders from home is, however, now so common a feature in Asiatic warfare as to be unable to divest itself of the air of calculation; and when the peccant French commander was immediately placed upon the list for promotion,

while the presence of the offending warship at Bangkok was utilized to hold a pistol in the shape of an ultimatum at the head of the Siamese king, it became obvious that the transgression was regarded with a not too censorious official eye at Paris.

The ascending scale of the unexpected had, however, not yet reached its zenith. When the contents of the ultimatum were made known, it was found that the French, emboldened by their success, and encouraged by the pacific assurances of Lord Rosebery, which they interpreted to mean that under no circumstances would England intervene in a quarrel between France and Siam, demanded not merely a pecuniary indemnity for the injuries inflicted upon French subjects in the course of the recent proceedings, which injuries they chivalrously appraised at a total of 3,000,000 francs, but also "the recognition of the rights of Annam and Cambodia to the territory on the left bank of the Mekong"—a phrase which was not only obscure, since nobody had any idea what those rights were or whence they arose, but which might portend, according to its geographical interpretation, either the cession of the region between the middle Mekong and the Annamite mountains, a territory some three hundred and sixty miles long by one hundred broad, or an area of thirty-six thousand square miles, or the surrender of the entire left bank of the river up to the Chinese frontier, including the important Siamese feudatory state of Luang Prabang, and a wide extent of country, amounting to some sixty thousand square miles, over which neither Annam nor Cambodia had ever exercised the most remote or transient of pretensions. The rights of *la force majeure* might explain, though they could hardly excuse, the minor spoliation; but the larger hypothesis of plunder seemed incompatible either with the slenderest show of reason, or with the assurances of respect for the independence and integrity of Siam, which the French Foreign Minister, M. Develle, had repeatedly given to Lord Rosebery, and continued to shower from the tribune.

Such also was the view taken by the Siamese Government. In a reply characterized by great dignity, the King expressed himself as ready to yield to "the pressure of circumstances," both in the matter of the pecuniary indemnity, and of the territorial cession, understanding the latter in its more limited sense, as applying to the trans-Mekong regions below the eighteenth parallel of latitude, over which alone could either Annam or Cam-

bodia be said to have exercised even the most disputable of rights. The region further to the north he declined to cede, in so far as it included his vassal kingdom of Luang Prabang, or was unable to cede, in the case of the more northerly states of Chieng Hong and Chieng Kheng which belonged to Great Britain as part of the heritage of the Upper Burma, and had lately been offered by her to China and Siam respectively on condition of their not being subsequently handed over to any other power.

It might have been thought that the conquerors would be satisfied with these ample rewards for an aggression which there was no longer any call either to argue or to defend. But the impending elections in France, the consciousness of superior local strength, and the apparent indifference of England, encouraged an appetite which had already been whetted by the preliminary spoils. The reply of the Siamese Government was regarded as a refusal of the ultimatum, and at the expiration of the forty-eight hours named in the original demand M. Pavie hauled down his flag and left Bangkok, while a blockade of the entire Siamese coast was declared, not the least of the pleasures resulting therefrom to French ideas being the fact that if enforced against the ships of neutral states the only country that would suffer in any serious degree would be Great Britain, which enjoyed 87 per cent., or almost a monopoly, of the carrying trade of the port of Bangkok, as against a 7 per cent. German and a 3 per cent. French proportion.

Terrified at these new reprisals, unable to procure from England anything but advice, and fearful of still further dismemberment if she persisted in a hopeless struggle, Siam now capitulated, yielding the full terms of the ultimatum, or in other words handing over to France the important vassal-state of Luang Prabang at the angle of the second great westerly bend of the Upper Mekong and its subsidiary districts, which had been occupied for years by Siamese posts. This was a surrender of territory as large again as the belt which it was understood that France had at first demanded, and which in his first reply the King of Siam had expressed his willingness to concede; and it planted the French at the principal point of their ambition, viz., Luang Prabang, which is regarded as the strategic centre of the Upper Mekong basin.

Once more, however, the Siamese were made to pay a price for their short-lived resistance, the temporary cession of their

Southern port of Chantabun and the permanent prohibition to keep either armed vessels on the Mekong and on the Talé Sap or Great Lake ; or military forces within a certain distance of their own bank of the Mekong and in the provinces adjoining the lake, being the last pound of flesh cut out by the French carving knife from the helpless victim.

Meanwhile negotiations had been proceeding at Paris between the English and French governments, the former, defining their stake in the so-called Burmese Shan states higher up the river, which Great Britain had only recently ceded to China and Siam, upon a guarantee that their integrity should be preserved. These negotiations resulted in the acceptance by both parties of the principle of a neutral zone, to separate their respective dominions in Indo-China, it being generally recognized that a coterminous frontier would entail increased military expenditure, as well as liability to friction and panic, upon both parties. What will be the exact limits of this buffer state have not yet been revealed, as I write ; and it would, therefore, be premature to pronounce how far it will serve its purpose as an instrument of peace ; whether it will resist the pressure which the expanding colonial ambitions of France are not unlikely, as time goes on, to apply to it, and what effect it will have upon the commercial enterprises of the two powers. In these respects we must hope for the best, though personally I should be reluctant to predicate durability of any such compromise.

Such is the history of the Franco-Siamese imbroglio, and of the latest stride towards that new ideal which is to compensate for the rude collapse of European ambitions by the colonial expansion of France. Without much effort, with no great loss of men and no enormous outlay, she has succeeded in humiliating her petty Asiatic neighbor, has extorted from his exchequer £120,000 for damages which would have been exorbitantly assessed at one-tenth of that total, and has stripped his dominion of some 70,000 square miles. I do not say much about the morality of the proceeding, partly because no two opinions can be held concerning it ; partly because morality seems to be out of vogue in international politics, and because I shall be told that all nations are tarred with the same brush, and that it is Pharisaism or hypocrisy to protest against a course which can hardly be wicked when it is so popular. In passing I will only say, with reference to the annex-

ation by England of Upper Burma in 1885, to which the French retort that their present proceeding is strictly parallel (forgetting that they have never ceased to denounce the English for so rare an example of perfidy)—that in Burma a bloody and rapacious potentate had brought his country to the verge of ruin by oppression and misrule, which can hardly be said of the present enlightened monarch of Siam ; that British interests in Burma, commercial, political and imperial, were overwhelming, while French interests in Siam are practically *nil* ; and that France herself was openly intriguing with King Thibau to our injury, while not the wildest French Chauvinist has been able to prove one act of British unfriendliness to the swelling colonial ambitions of the Republic.

Let me discuss, however, what is the positive gain to France, other than the mere pride of predatory triumph, resulting from her acquisitions. There will undoubtedly be some accretion of that mysterious appanage of prestige, which in the East attends the conquerer, without reference to the motives or methods of conquest, and which in parts of the world upon whose intelligence the law of nations has never dawned, is the conscious homage paid by weakness to strength. Siam will be even more afraid of her powerful neighbor than she was before, and may find it difficult, without assistance, to avert or to resist yet further encroachments upon her own independence. But as regards the territory itself of which the French have become the masters, I doubt very much whether it will repay them even the slight trouble of appropriation ; still more whether it will meet the costs of administration ; most of all whether it will secure for them the main and ultimate objects which have inspired its seizure. The districts in question are largely covered with stunted forest or pathless jungle ; they admit of but little cultivation, and they are only sparsely populated by wild and uncivilized tribes. The climate in many parts is unsuited to European constitutions, and I tremble for the fate of the French conscript who may find himself condemned to the cheerless and malarial solitude of a Laotian outpost. The usual horde of French functionaries, for whose employment her colonies appear chiefly to subsist, will probably appear upon the scene ; but their salaries are far more likely to be drawn from the home exchequer than they are from the scanty resources which they will themselves dispense.

The main object, however, with which the French have embarked upon this enterprise, has been the hope of diverting from Bangkok and securing for Saigon the trade of the Mekong valley, and in the last resort of winning for France, and snatching from England, the commercial spoils of Yunnan. In this expectation I believe that they will be cruelly disappointed. It has been the unanimous verdict of all travellers, of whatever nationality, that the Mekong River, by reason of its numerous rapids, is utterly unfitted for continuous or lucrative navigation by steam power, whilst there is not a town of any importance upon its banks but Luang Prabang. As for the trade with China, what the French, who are deficient in commercial aptitudes, have failed to do from the vantage ground and vicinity of Tongking, they are hardly likely to effect over the elongated and costly line of river communication from Cochin China.

I doubt, therefore, whether the French will see any interest for many years to come upon the immense capital which they are now pledging with so light a heart in the interior recesses of Further Asia. After ten years Tongking is not yet pacified ; and the new and vastly extended border will invite fresh enemies, will require additional guards, and will exact more lives. Within the past year the French Chamber, notoriously fickle, and, except in its jingo mood, suspicious of colonial enterprise, has supported by a majority of only twenty odd votes the retention of Tongking ; and a serious local disaster might at any time evoke from the French electorate, whose temper is not to be judged from the French newspapers, a cry for retreat or evacuation. Furthermore, if obeying the inevitable law of advance, the French, not satisfied with their present acquisitions, attempt still further encroachments upon the integrity of Siam, they are not unlikely to find themselves brought into conflict with both China and Great Britain. The former, who has already sufficient cause for distrust and hostility in the memories of Tongking and of the war of 1885, would not welcome the French as neighbors upon a new frontier, or as competitors in old markets. Possessed of an enormous latent force, she can make her antagonism felt in manifold and clandestine ways, as the story of the Black Flags in Tongking conclusively shows. England, for her part, cannot acquiesce in any further advance that would have the effect of squeezing the buffer

state of Siam out of existence, and of planting herself and France face to face in Indo-China. Siam has been humbled and mutilated; we could not be equally indifferent to her extinction. No country can escape the advantages or disadvantages of its geographical position. Did Siam lie altogether outside the radius of Indian interests, we might afford to sit still whilst the French gobbled it up piece by piece. But possessing, as it does, a coterminous frontier with India many hundred miles long in the Malay Peninsula, in Tenasserim, in Lower and Upper Burma, and in the Shan States, and situated, as it therefore is, upon the slope of the Indian glaxis, we cannot be careless of its destiny. The enormous preponderance of British commercial interests is an additional ground of concern. England need feel no jealousy of the Asiatic ambitions of France so long as they are confined within an area that involves no positive menace to her own Asiatic dominion. There is ample room for both powers in the Asian continent, and each has work enough, and to spare, within its existing borders. If the Siamese incident produces any such conviction on the part of the French it will have had one result that can be spoken of with satisfaction. But if successful cupidity provokes the desire for more, I can only foresee friction and trouble in the future between the two great powers whose common interest it is to remain friends.

GEORGE N. CURZON.

II.—A FRENCH VIEW.

BY MADAME ADAM.

IF I recognize the greatness of old England in a liberal organ of free America, it is not because I dream, after the fashion of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, of a union between my country and perfidious Albion, but to prove that that greatness is due to a large extent to our want of foresight, to our weakness, to our indifference to the snares laid for us, and also to our excessive chivalry and self-denial. I shall not refer to past centuries, nor to the wars between England and France. The soil of France has so often been trampled under foot by the Englishman, so many events have been interfered with in our country by the intrigues of English diplomacy, that entire volumes would be required to

establish the measure of England's responsibility for the most distressing events in our national life.

Whenever France has had a difficulty, England has either produced, intensified, maintained it, or prevented its being overcome. She has ever been the enemy of France and owes her power to her not forgetting that fact for a moment. A sinister law—discovered or, rather, formulated by one of the bold thinkers of England—governs, and will increasingly govern, the relations of English and French national life. This law is the struggle for existence!

We both have our dreams, our near neighbors and ourselves: an England ever greater on the one hand—a France ever greater on the other. By what superior right do they arrogate to themselves more than we? Their superiority lies solely in their desire. But we now want to have desires of our own, too! You will never find, no matter how far you look through the past, a single statesman in England that has not made political capital out of his anti-French sentiments, and I envy England the innumerable company of all the men who have either opposed or seduced or deceived us. I only desire that in future France may act with respect to her Republican policy as England does with regard to her Imperial policy, and that every Frenchman may be as good a Frenchman as every Englishman is a good Englishman.

I said that I shall not go far back in the common history of perfidious Albion and France, but, as the questions obtaining just now between England and ourselves are, above all, colonial, my readers will, I hope, allow me to revert at least to Louis XIV. and Colbert. The motives which prompted them to establish the East India Company were the same as induced England to conquer Hindustan. "We must," said the great minister of the great king, "go to India because the density of the population and the richness of the soil will at once increase our commerce, and there are products in India of which France is absolutely in need." If Colbert's work in India has been ruined to the advantage of England, which now carries on a commerce of several millions, and enjoys a budget equivalent to that of France, it is not only the fault of Louis XV., but that of the directors and stockholders who abandoned Dupleix and paved the way for Clive's success.

While France and England were contending for India, they planted their banners, the one in the valley of the Mekong, and

the other in the valley of the Irawaddy. One of the terms of the law of the struggle for existence among the nations who colonize is "advance or disappear." This Indo-Chinese question is not one of the present only. Colbert was the first pioneer of Tonquin, and of our Indo-Chinese empire. Clive was the pioneer of Burmah. Ever since the end of the 18th century they said at Calcutta: "We must have Burmah because it contains the teak-forests indispensable to our marine, because it will enable us to weld India and Southern China together, and to prevent any other European nations from getting hold of a better commercial route to China." Louis XIV. concluded, about 1783, an advantageous treaty with the King of Annam, because it was said at Versailles: "We must establish ourselves in the Mekong Valley to counterbalance England in India, to provide for the victualling of our fleet, to increase our prestige in the Far East, and to reach the rich markets of Southern China, to which Indo-China is the gate." Such was the situation a century ago, when neither England nor France yet thought of Shanghai, of Canton, or Han Kow. The entire attention of the two rivals was then concentrated on Indo-China, that appendage of the Celestial Empire. Their objective points were Yunnan and Tchong-King. France had, however, preceded England. The French flag appeared there the first, and we signed, at Versailles, on the eve of our great Revolution, in 1789, a treaty as a base of our work in Indo-China.

At the time of our conquest of Annam, and its western rampart, the Mekong valley, England was not yet firmly established in the Irawaddy valley. The French missionaries—let it be said to their credit—were the first to initiate our advance. They said to Louis XIV.: "Rely upon the Court of Annam, and you will push Colbert's work farther east." France has, therefore, the first place, the place of honor, in Indo-China, as it had in India. The causes which determined France and England, in the first part of this century, to occupy Rangoon and Tourane had other motives than those which led to the occupation of Lower Burmah. Since the English banner has floated at Rangoon and the French banner at Saigon, the rival camps demanded a "march forward!" It was plainly perceived, both at Rangoon and at Saigon, that there was something else in Indo-China besides the commerce of those valleys and besides Mandalay, Hué and

Hanoi. They said at Rangoon: "Let us seek the best commercial route to Yunnanfou, Kueyanfou, and Tchung-King." They said at Saigon: "Southern and Western China are not inaccessible to France; all things lead us there—our treaties and nature." Is Tonkin not a dependency of Annam, then, and does the Red River not place Haiphon in communication with Laokai, the gate to China? They obeyed these considerations fifty years ago, both at Rangoon and at Saigon, when commercial expeditions were organized towards the markets of Yunnan. We recall, on our side, the great and memorable "mission of Mekong" in 1868, the modest and glorious chief of which, Captain Doudart de Lagree, succumbed to fever in Yunnan.

The question to-day has entered on a new phase. For a century the two rivals had been confined to their respective valleys, of the Irawaddy and Mekong. France and England are now touching one another, and both nations bring to the encounter their respective temperaments, characters, and morals. England does not hesitate a moment. "I want a part of the Mekong valley," she says, "and I shall get the right bank, which does not belong to me, by tenacity, efforts, intrigues." France hesitates. "If I contented myself with the left bank," thinks she, "this concession may bring about a favorable *modus vivendi*."

And this is how, since 1886, since the annexation of Upper Burmah was officially announced by Lord Dufferin, England has acted boldly while France has timidly, not to say indifferently, remained inert. As a matter of fact what opposition have we made in Tonquin to Lord Lamington? What have we done to prove to Mandalay that Burmah proper does not include the Shans Trans-Salouens that were not comprised in the act of cession in 1886? What did we do at Tonquin and Paris to take possession of the Shan principalities while England was busying herself in suppressing brigandage in Burmah proper? And because we have done nothing our implacable rival declares impertinently that since we did not occupy the right bank of the Mekong it belongs to her. But would the Siamese, too, have been authorized on that ground to take from us the right and left banks of the Lower Mekong?

We are confronted with an accomplished fact in the valley of the Upper Mekong, but, indeed, our rival's march to the East is actually becoming singularly threatening. If we had, in 1886,

gone as far as Salouen, who could have stopped us? Suppose we had done to Mandalay what Mandalay does now to Hué? Would the army of Upper Burmah have arrested our advance to the East? It was at that time occupied in the valley of the Irawaddy and suffered daily serious losses.

It is because of our negligence that the right bank of the Mekong has been occupied. Is it not to ask of us too much blindness to our interests; is it not to demand too much self-effacement of a proud people that knows its rights, to expect that we should live on good terms of neighborhood with a people who act in such a way? And it is astonishing how from age to age it is always the same defiance on our side, while on the other side of the Channel it is always the same policy of intimidation and monopolization. The rights which England pretends to have over Ava on the right bank of the Mekong are shadowy enough, but how haughtily does she affirm them! How unscrupulous and contrary to both history and nature it is to demand such a partition of the Mekong valley, as England aims at!

France has an immense interest in occupying the right bank of the Mekong. The law of the history of Upper Laos, as well as the indications supplied by nature, compel us to regulate the question of Upper Laos according to our very precise rights.

But how many plots had to be frustrated, how many traps to be shunned; what an activity (already too slow) had to be shown to stop the slowly and surely accomplished progress of the Siamese, who, guided by England, daily encroached upon our Indo-Chinese Empire! We have so allowed them to act for some years that to-day the Siamese posts are at the gates of Hué, at the distance of a few days from Hanoi.

The attack is so threatening that it awakes us, and we are now, it would seem, ready to resist. But how much time do we lose and what leisure do we leave to the Siamese to arm themselves! Always the same French slowness in face of English boldness!

Lord Lamington said plainly in the House of Lords that "England has more interest than all the other European nations in establishing herself in Siam." To which we simply reply: "France has more interest than all the other European nations in establishing herself in Siam." Before formulating among the peers the complaints of England against France, Lord Lam-

ington had indicated them in a sensational article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in which he stated that the French in Siam would not be permitted to increase their forces in Siam ; that *the commerce at Bangkok is principally in the hands of the English*, and that there is a numerous population of several millions of Malays, Indians and Chinese under English protection.

Bear in mind that "the Indians of Siam" are under the "protection of England" and that she is to a certain extent responsible for their acts. We shall have to recall it later in connection with the question of slavery in Siam. The French have, then, according to Lord Lamington, in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, not any right to Siam ! And the English proclaim Siam's neutrality, tempered, it is true, by an occasional protectorate over a certain part of a population recruited by them, and say the French do not have the right in any case to add to their forces ; and we read in the *Globe* of June 30 :

"It is satisfactory to know that the government has recognized, according to the reply of Sir E. Grey, the possibility of a serious popular disturbance in the population of Bangkok."

But, may it not be, O *Globe*, among the thousands of Malays, Indians and Chinese protected by England, that this satisfactory and serious disturbance occurs ? "But," continues the journal, "orders have been given to reinforce the 'Swift' with another war-ship, and to keep a third vessel ready to join them at the first request."

Are not Albion's perfidy and haughty indifference to injustice fully displayed in these incidents of her policy ? We are blind, yes, blind, to hesitate in face of such an infatuation of "absolute and exclusive" right ? How would England have treated a race of inferior civilization, she, who proclaims herself to be the superior race ?

"It is time," says the *Globe* (June 7), "that Lord Rosebery put an end to the piratical proceedings of the French, and the sooner, the better." The same article pities the unfortunate Siamese who are "compelled to evacuate their positions by the French filibusters." What would the English press say if one of our great journals were to speak of the English in Egypt, Madagascar, Siam or wherever we are in contact with them, as "pirates" and "filibusters" ? But the Englishman does, acts

and speaks as he pleases. Wherever he sojourns, he imposes his life, his manners and habits, his tastes and his productions. He claims respect and expects admiration.

Is it possible, in this age of struggle for existence, to resist Old England's triumphant, superb and enviable resources of aggression otherwise than by aggression of the same kind? Francis Garnier wrote almost a quarter of a century ago, regarding the English intrigues at Bangkok, in prophetic words, from which I borrow an admirable quotation from the brochure of Dr. Pichon of Shanghai :

"We have, unfortunately, thus far subordinated our policy to that of England. Accustomed to undervalue our distant interests, we have always sacrificed them to the necessities of an *entente cordiale*. These sacrifices have been without return. The more we effaced our policy before that of our allies, the less they have considered us. We should in future follow an opposite line of conduct. That policy which employs all honor and skill in obtaining the prevalence of national interests is alone fruitful, as it is alone sincere."

We want more than fine words of the tribune; we want the political procedure advised by Garnier—and yet, we recommence the same mistakes we made in China. We allow ourselves to spend weeks in a siege in the Island of Khong, instead of going to speak plainly at Bangkok. We shall certainly do the latter in the long run, but only when Siam will have enough cannon and torpedoes to kill our soldiers and wreck our vessels.

But, it is said, if you resist the English, you will force them to the Triple Alliance, and this argument has always the same importance to unthinking minds. Whatever France may do—if she is resolved on considering the Russian interests as complementary to her own—she will always find the English interests antagonistic to her and her allies. We must, therefore, choose. And this is so true that the triumphant and clever chief of the German Socialists, Liebknecht, said in one of his latest speeches in the Reichstag on the Army Bill: "Germany would, in case of war with France, in which Russia would also take part, be just as sure of England as she is now of Italy and Austria." What useless apprehensions are conjured up to stop us in asserting our rights in the face of England, whose policy is the policy of exclusive interest always well understood, studied and meditated on. This policy assures us that in fact, if not in form, the Foreign Office will "do neither less nor more," whether we reso-

lutely oppose the excessive demands of England or slavishly submit to them. If we resist, there is a chance; if we submit, there is none. England is convinced that we are unfit for colonizing and powerless to establish a colonial policy. Let us prove to her the contrary and compel her to respect us a little more, even if she cannot love us less.

But let us return to Siam—and to our necessity of struggling there until we obtain the integral possession of our rights. Let us not forget that, in Asia just as in Africa, if we permit our adversaries to withdraw one stone from the base of our edifice the whole work is doomed. The Siamese question is not merely an Asiatic question. It touches (as I have often written) on the great problems of Central Asia, the progressive solution of which might assure the peace of the world, from an economical, political and social point of view. Russia, whose ally we desire to be, does not alone endeavor to obtain a political suzerainty in Asia. When thanks to the cotton of Fergana and elsewhere she will have created mills and merchandise enough to inundate China and all Asiatic Russia, from Samarkand to Vladivostock, she shall have gained a battle which will render futile all the armaments of India in the Chitral. We are, therefore, working for the peace of the world by solving the Siamese question in conformity with our honor, traditions, rights and interests.

I should here have closed this article if I had not thought that another question would interest our American readers—the question of slavery, which in Indo-China is quite as crying as in Africa. England and France will show which of them will side in both these countries with the slave-traders. Thanks to a communication from one of our ex-residents at Hué, I can certify to the truth of the following statement:

“I have examined that question closely,” said M. Rheinart. “I know of what unheard-of evils it is the source. When travelling up the Mekong in 1869, I have seen troops of slaves forced to the hardest work; I have seen convoys of them driven by Siamese to their slave-markets. I have seen unfortunate beings become unable to work, left utterly abandoned on the public roads—reduced to die of starvation if charity failed them. I have seen Annamites become slaves after they had been carried off by savage tribes who find a profitable outlet for this traffic in the territory of Siam. The gravest event occurred about 1876. It will be found recorded in the archives of the government at Saigon and in the Bangkok Consulate.

“Under the pretext of pursuing bands of Hos, pillaging bands of Chinese—remnants of the Black Flags—the Siamese invaded Tran-ninh and

destroyed everything. Those inhabitants who could not escape in time were made prisoners and led into slavery. There were several thousand of them, among them two or three Annamite officials who were on duty in that region. All these unfortunate persons were dragged to the banks of the Menam and packed on floats, to be brought to Bangkok. As a result of the fatigues, privations and miseries of all kinds, hundreds of them perished miserably during this march, and other hundreds on the floats. By the number of victims, this barbarous razzia surpasses in horror all we know of the brutalities of the African slave trade; so much so that the consular staff at Bangkok was so deeply moved that they determined to visit the floats; but it was too late—death had done its work and thinned the ranks. As to the victims who marked the route followed towards Laos, not one of them survived. The officials were sent back to Hué and some presents followed them shortly afterwards as a peace-offering to the Annam government. [Rheinart transported the chests containing those presents.] But the Tran-ninh remained uninhabited and ravaged.”

Here the statement of our resident ends. I add to it, that the Siamese are a lazy people; and that their public service is made up in large part of Indians—English *protégés*. They do not seem to be prepossessed in favor of suppressing slavery. The very opposite.

JULIETTE ADAM.

POLAR PROBABILITIES OF 1894.

BY BRIGADIER-GENERAL A. W. GREELY, CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER
U. S. A.

ON OCTOBER 27, 1876, there anchored at Queenstown Her Majesty's ship "Alert," its sides of oak scarred by many an ice-floe and its heart of oak sore at the unpropitious end of its polar quest; for under the Irish Sea and across the fields of England flashed to the British Admiralty a brief message declaring that the "pole was impracticable." This outcome of an expedition formed of the flower of the Royal Navy, organized under the auspices of Arctic experts and equipped with a lavishness hitherto unknown, gave rise to a widespread belief that the days of polar explorations were past, and that the dreadful waste of human energy and life in the Arctic regions had ceased, unless, as in whaling cruises, there was heard "the jingling of the guinea which helps the hurt that honor feels."

The restless energy and unbounded ambition of the English-speaking peoples were factors not taken into consideration by these prophets of inaction and acquiescence, for no sooner is a fortune acquired or leisure obtained than time and money are given without stint to find a missionary in the wilds of Africa, to determine the currents of mid-ocean, to deport almost an entire oppressed nation to new climes, or to such other scheme, quixotic or practical, as appeals to the modern Croesus.

In Arctic as in other labors failure oft stimulates to success, and the British expedition of 1876 furnished in its mail-tender, the "Pandora," a ship for the next North-Polar voyage, which, rechristened as the "Jeannette," carried the fortunes of De Long and his brave comrades. In later years Arctic expeditions have been so common as to excite only local comment, and there are

not half a dozen men in this country who can name two out of three of the many voyages of the last fifteen years.

It is not inappropriate, then, that the three important expeditions of this year should be briefly discussed, since all three have for their end and aim the attainment of the farthest north—the reaching of the North Pole. Over what route and by what means these explorers hope to pass the unequalled northing made by Lockwood, of my own expedition, will now be considered. These voyages are not only made under the auspices of three different nations, but follow three widely-separated routes in their lines of operation. Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, the Norwegian, goes by the New Siberian Islands or the Asiatic route; Mr. C. R. Jackson, the Englishman, by Franz Josef Land, or the European pathway; while our own countryman, the gallant and successful Peary, continues in the distinctively American route, through Baffin Bay, with the west coast of Greenland as his base of supplies.

Nansen's project has undergone material modifications since it was made public in 1891. In brief, it contemplates, as its author says, the utilization of nature's forces, by means of a drift voyage with the main ice-pack of the Siberian Ocean across, or in the neighborhood of, the pole. Its ultimate success depends on the absolute correctness of Nansen's conjecture that a constant current sets from Bering Sea across the polar ocean to the north of Franz Josef Land, whence it turns southward between Spitzbergen and Greenland. Nansen originally proposed to follow De Long's route through Bering Sea, thence along the north coast of Asia to the neighborhood of the New Siberian Islands, when, boldly pushing his vessel into the middle of the polar pack, he expects, in the course of three or four years, to drift across the pole to Greenland. He has, however, changed his itinerary, and, in his voyage to the New Siberian Islands, has followed the route made famous by Norden-skiöld in his circumnavigation of Asia, through the seas of Barent and Kara and around Cape Cheliuskin, the northernmost point of Asia. The means and methods as announced by Nansen are as follows:

"1. To build a strong ship, so strong that it can withstand the pressure of the ice, and, living in this ship, to float across (or near the pole) with the ice-pack. Or, 2d, to take only boats along and camp on the ice floes and live there while floating across."

Both methods are to be followed. His ship "*Fram*,"

just large enough to carry provisions and fuel for twelve men for five or six years, is to be supplemented by two peculiar flat-bottomed, decked boats, in which the crew will be housed during their journey of two or three years, in case the "Fram" is lost.

At an Arctic meeting of the Royal Geographical Society in November, 1892, Nansen set forth his plan in detail, and it was discussed by the leading polar commanders of Great Britain, including McClintock, Nares, Inglefield, Young, Richards and Hooker. While admiring the courage of Nansen, not one of these experienced officers commended his plan. Melville views it with marked disfavor, and no word of commendation has been made by Nordenskiöld, Koldewey, Payer, Holm or Hovgaard.

Admiral Sir Leopold McClintock, the famous Arctic traveller, does not conceal his fears as to the great dangers to which Nansen proposes to expose himself, and considers that under any pressure by the ice during the winter months the probability of the vessel's sliding up on the ice is very remote. He points out that Nansen's boats are too large and will be difficult to handle among the polar floes, which frequently rush against each other without warning, so that ice which is safe at one moment may in half an hour be extremely dangerous.

While complimenting his pluck, Sir George Nares shows that Nansen disregards every adopted axiom of successful navigation of the polar regions, and deliberately intrusts himself to a perilous drift with the natural movements of the polar ice; this, too, solely on a hypothetical idea of ocean currents concerning which nothing is definitely known. Apart from the well-known danger of besetment by the polar pack, Nares questions gravely the direction of the drift, and he quotes from De Long to show that the only currents experienced by the "Jeannette" in this very region were those caused by the prevailing wind.

Sir Allen Young believes there is land in nearly every direction near the pole, and considers it extremely dangerous for a ship to drift with the pack, since it might impinge on land, and be kept for years, in which case he fully agrees with McClintock that Nansen's large boats would not be manageable, in case of disaster, for retreat to open water. Admiral Sir George Richards speaks most uncompromisingly against the project, saying that any one speaking with authority ought to speak out when so much was at

stake. Sir Joseph Hooker, from his Antarctic service, believes that no ship of whatever build could long resist destruction if committed to the moving ice pack. If thrown upon a new coast, he thought that the enfeebled and probably reduced ship's company would have no prospect of safe retreat. Hooker points out the possibility of scurvy, the depressing influence upon the crew which must result from long confinement in close quarters during many months of darkness, extreme cold, inaction, ennui, constant peril, and from harassing doubts as to the future. While not considering the journey impossible, he considers it impracticable.

Nansen believes that his vessel is so strong and is constructed on such lines that it can scarcely be crushed by the ice if properly handled, but that, under all circumstances, under pressure of the polar pack, the ship will simply be lifted out by the ice. No non-professional man can properly criticise Nansen's ideas as to his ice-proof ship, the "*Fram*," but fortunately two men of extended Arctic experience have spoken clearly on this point. They are Admiral Sir George Nares, whose works on seamanship are authority in Great Britain, and Chief Engineer George W. Melville, whose abilities have contributed so largely to the late splendid successes of our navy, as exemplified in its magnificent ships. Nares points out that when once frozen in the polar pack, the form of the vessel goes for nothing, and that there is no record of a vessel frozen in the polar pack having been disconnected from the ice so as to be capable of rising under pressure as a separate body detached from the ice-floe, even in the height of summer.

In 1884, Melville, commenting on criticisms from non-experts as to the shape, strength and material of a perfect Arctic ship, wrote as follows :

"Suppose a ship constructed in the shape of a parabolic spindle, its greatest transverse diameter thirty feet, its length two hundred feet. This would give a body of fine lines, good rising power if nipped below its greatest diameter, and for speed and strength be an acknowledged model. Now build this spindle solid of buoyant material, hooping it like a mast with iron or steel bands, so arranged with reference to weight that the spindle will float like ice, one-eighth part above water. Yet even this pattern of strength would be an egg-shell in the power of the mighty masses of ice, never at rest, but always grinding, like the everlasting gods, : . . even the granite hills and islands."

The experiences of previous expeditions indicate clearly the probabilities of success in Nansen's drift journey.

McClintock, in his *Voyage of the Fox*, when his ship was beset in Baffin Bay, records: "Feb. 15, 1858. Daylight reveals evidences of vast ice movements during the dark months when we fancied all was quiet; and we now see how greatly we have been favored, what innumerable chances of destruction we have unconsciously escaped." He describes on two occasions ice disruptions near the "Fox" on calm nights, when the actions and sounds of the uprising polar pack were appalling. In speaking of ice movements, March 18, he adds: "No one in his senses could avoid reflecting upon the inevitable fate of a ship if exposed to such fearful pressure." Elsewhere, he "can understand how men's hair has turned gray in a few hours"; and, despite boats and sledges ready for use, states: "Had our vessel been destroyed after the ice broke up, there remained no hope for us."

The "Polaris," in Smith Sound, according to the official narrative, "was raised up bodily and thrown over on her port side," "the great floe itself (to which the 'Polaris' had been anchored for two months) had cracked in several places," and later disrupted so suddenly that nineteen men were cut off from the ship and never regained it. The eventful drift-voyage of thirteen hundred miles, under Captain Tyson, indicates the coming experiences of Nansen, save that the Norwegian has four to five months of continuous darkness to endure. In the "Polaris" ice-drift there is constant reference in the official narrative to the anxiety and danger from ice disruption. To emphasize the suddenness of such movements of the polar pack, and the impossibility of foreseeing or guarding against the separation of the party, reference is made to April 5, 1873, when before daylight the main floe broke into four pieces, one piece carrying away one of the huts so suddenly that the inmates barely escaped with only a part of their effects. The next day, fortunately in daylight, the floe again split with a great noise, cutting the hunter's hut in two. At midnight of March 8, the floe broke between the tent and boat, which were so close together that there was not space to walk between them. Had the break been a few feet to one side the entire tent party would have fallen into the sea, but as it was, the kayak, the boat, and their astronomer were carried away, and it almost seemed an intervention of Divine Providence that, after seven hours of terrible effort, they rescued the frozen and nearly dead comrade and the boats on which the lives of the

whole party depended. The mental condition of these hardy men is clearly set forth :

"For those who attempted to rest the body there was no repose for the mind. One after another would spring up from his sleeping-bag and make a wild dash forward, as if to avoid some sudden danger."

The experiences of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition on September 28, 1883, when drifting *a la Nansen*, is reproduced from my notes :

"The gale increased in violence, causing such conflict between the heavy floes as it is beyond the power of language to describe. Our own floe was from forty to fifty feet in thickness, and yet it tumbled and cracked like chalk under the tremendous pressure of the surrounding floes. As the edges of these immense masses of ice ground against each other, with terrible groaning and almost irresistible force, their margins were covered for several rods with thousands of tons of broken ice. . . . Just as the whaleboat party quitted their snow-house a shock of unusual violence split our floe again, and a wide crack, running through the abandoned house, speedily swallowed up a portion of it. Even as we rapidly rolled up the tepee, a narrow crack formed under our feet."

Fortunately, it was daylight, and the jam of paleocrystic floes continued long enough to permit the bold men to rush boats, sledges and baggage in desperation across an unstable bridge of small rubble ice, held together by pressure, which opened as the last man passed and nearly dropped him into the sea.

It is unnecessary to quote from Back's experiences in the "Terror;" of Koldewey, first in the "Hansa," and, after she was crushed, in boats off the east coast of Greenland; of Weyprecht in the "Tegethoff," or of De Long in the "Jeannette;" they all testify to the tremendous force of the disruption of the main ice-pack, both in storm and in perfect calm, and concur that no vessel can escape save almost by miracle. It is significant that no vessel ever beset in the main pack of the Siberian ocean has escaped therefrom.

Nansen has against him, as illustrated by the experiences of his predecessors, the certainty that his ship is not ice proof; the impracticability of handling his large boats when his ship sinks; the possibility of the polar pack suddenly disrupting and separating the party and its materials; the probability that in three years disease or accident will break down his party physically,

and the almost absolute certainty that the Arctic night, with its unbroken darkness of four to five months and its accompanying life of monotony, inactivity, cold, limited quarters and restricted diet, will impair the mental and moral energies of his men.

Assuming, as is fairly probable, that the general direction of the ice-drift is correctly surmised by Nansen, yet it is largely dominated by the wind. The prevailing winds depend entirely on the relative distribution of atmospheric pressures, and while the polar pressures are comparatively constant, yet they are liable to extraordinary changes from year to year, thus introducing an element of great uncertainty in the most important factor of Nansen's success, the direction of the drift.

In my opinion the scheme is unwise, impracticable and is little short of suicidal. If an almost miraculous escape, similar to that of the "Polaris" drift-party, spares these daring and determined men it will in no wise prove its wisdom or advisability.

The objects in view by Mr. Jackson in his polar expedition to Franz Josef Land and towards the North Pole are summarized by him under two heads as follows :

"1. The general exploration of Franz Josef Land, and, in particular, the discovery and mapping of its northern regions ; the observation of the climatic conditions encountered ; the recording of such geological evidence as is met with, and the general investigation of the geological conditions of the country.

"2. An advance in a northerly direction which shall be so far continued as to bring me within the immediate locality of the North Pole, and an endeavor, by all means in my power, to observe the geographical conditions at that mathematical point."

The route followed by Jackson presents the most promising field for reaching either the North Pole or a very high latitude. Franz Josef Land was discovered by Weyprecht and Payer in 1873-4, during the voyage of the "Teghetoff," which ship, beset within two days of its starting, drifted northeastward to the new land, on the shores of which it was abandoned by the crew, who safely returned by way of Nova Zembla. Apart from the besetment of his ship, Payer considered this land the true route to the pole, as well he might, since with a small party he reached latitude $82^{\circ} 05' N.$, a latitude exceeded on land only by Meyer in 1871, by Aldrich in 1876 and by Lockwood in 1882. Payer's most northerly point was 124 geographical miles to the northward of his ship.

It remained for a gallant and adventurous Englishman, Mr. Leigh Smith, to extend very considerably the limits of Franz Josef Land, to prove its easy accessibility and demonstrate its fitness as the true route to the North Pole. Smith avoided the main ice-pack of Barent Sea, and skirting its western limit easily reached the western shores of this land and in latitude 80° N., longitude 48° E., discovered a safe harbor named Eira, after his ship; during this and later voyages he made such extensive discoveries that his name has been fittingly placed upon this new coast. In one voyage, losing his ship by an unfortunate accident, Smith wintered at Eira harbor, where game proved sufficiently abundant to supply his party with meat.

Jackson intends landing at Eira Harbor, or at the most northerly suitable and accessible point on the west coast of Leigh Smith Land. His main party will consist of ten men, and the northward journey will be made by dog sledges as far as possible, and, when land fails, by whale boats. It is expected that the main journey will be made during the summer of 1894, and that Mr. Jackson will return in no event later than 1895 with such results as will prove whether the pole is practicable or not by the way of Franz Josef Land. Detailed information is wanting as to Jackson's equipment for field travel—a most important matter, since its lightness and fitness always forms an important factor in the success of Arctic exploration. The English explorer, however, while working quietly and modestly, has apparently considered his journey in all its bearings, and it is probable that his party has been well selected and has been equipped with the most modern and most approved methods; in which case there will be good reason to expect from Jackson's efforts quite extensive additions to our knowledge of Arctic lands, and possibly the attainment of an unprecedently high latitude.

The extraordinary journey of Robert E. Peary, civil engineer in the United States Navy, across the inland ice of Greenland, had made this young officer famous and his name known to every intelligent American. His second journey, on practically the same lines and over the same route as in 1891, has excited very general interest, especially as he is the third explorer now striving for the honors of the farthest north. His base of operations will be Inglefield Gulf, on the west coast of Greenland, 77.5° north

latitude, 71° west longitude. The outlines of Peary's plans are derived from Mr. Cyrus C. Adams, one of the leading geographers of the country, who has taken a lively interest in the organization and success of the expedition. The dog teams of previous years will be supplemented by donkeys as pack animals, and with these motors Peary will travel across the ice-cap direct from his home station to Independence Bay, 81° 35' N., 33° W., with five or six men. Half of the party will then return southward and, tracing the eastern edge of the inland ice to the vicinity of Cape Bismarck, regain Inglefield Gulf by the easiest route. Peary will turn northwards to explore the archipelago discovered by Lockwood, and, if necessary, he contemplates wintering at Independence Bay, living in stone or snow huts and subsisting on the game of the country—musk-oxen, hares and seals. It is not denied that both Peary's observations and Lockwood's explorations far to the northwest prove that the archipelago is not ice clad, and it is frankly admitted that as travel beyond Independence Bay must be by sledge along shore, unfavorable conditions of coast and ice would make the advance journey arduous and dangerous. The possible extension of Peary's work towards the pole is touched on, and the admission made that should the polar pack be favorable it is not improbable that the land will be left for a sea journey.

The exact object in view must be known to intelligently forecast or determine the degree of success of his expedition. This difficulty which presents itself in passing upon the success of Peary's first expedition still exists. On April 4, 1891, under his own hand Peary wrote to the National Geographical Society: "The advance party will push on . . . to the head of De Long Fiord, establish a depot, thence to the northern terminus of Greenland." He did not reach De Long Fiord or come within 70 miles of it, and the northern terminus of Greenland instead of being to the north of De Long Fiord was found to be where I placed it in 1882, near the 82d parallel.

The following letter of April, 1891, forecast that journey and it applies equally to the present voyage:

"I have no doubt that you will be able to make a remarkable journey on the inland ice. I have no faith, however, in your being able to go beyond either Sherard Osborn Fiord or possibly Victoria or Nordenskiöld inlet.

There is the strongest possible circumstantial evidence to prove that one of these fiords separates the northern part of Greenland, and you will look in vain in any of the reports of Arctic travellers for indications of the inland ice to the northward of the eighty-first degree. Doubtless the ice does extend further north in the interior of Greenland, and in such case you would reach the northern extremity of it and doubtless be able to skirt it.

"It seems to me it would be worth your while rather to reach the vicinity of the east Greenland coast to the north of Cape Bismarck. There is no doubt the farther north you go the better chances you would have for travelling over good snow."

There are not ten men in the country, including Peary's entire party, who can to-day, without consulting Peary's account in the *New York Sun*, describe as accurately what Peary did as I foretold prior to the journey. While Peary failed in his ultimate object, yet his journey across Greenland to Independence Bay was a magnificent piece of work, which fully justified Melville's confidence in glacier travelling set forth in 1884, and my own view given in the above-mentioned letter.

In my opinion the party will trace the inland ice southward from Independence Bay to the vicinity of Cape Bismarck, but I do not believe it will ever travel one hundred miles to the north-eastward of Independence Bay.

The inland ice and Peary's travelling outfit are like the smooth roads of Central Park and the light carriages used therein, but when the wretched, heavy roads of winter are reached in the open country heavy wagons are needful, so the distorted icefoot and broken floes of the polar seas demand special sledges. Listen to Peary's own description of a twelve miles' journey without baggage after leaving the icefoot :

"My feet were on the sharp chaos-strewn rocks which cover the icefoot borders of this land of rock. . . . My mountains seemed to recede as I advanced, and it was eight hours before I reached the summit. . . . I was strongly tempted to go on, but my foot-gear precluded it; the soles of both kamiks (mocassins) were cut through and the edges of sharp rocks had cut my feet. It was even questionable whether I could fix up my foot-gear in order to get back without serious injury to my feet."

Obliged to use his sealskin mittens, his cap and part of his garments to protect his feet, he speaks of the excruciating pain which marked this journey of twenty-four miles in thirteen hours. As to the reserve powers for a longer journey, it need only be said that of sixteen dogs only four returned to Whale Sound. It thus seems impossible to accumulate stores at Inde-

pendence Bay, and a winter camp with its hundred and forty days of continuous darkness, appears little short of madness to a party expecting to live on the scanty and migratory game of the country.

In his sketch map (New York *Sun*, October 31, 1892) Peary extends the northern coast of Independence Bay some fifty miles eastward, to about 25° west longitude. This easterly extension of bold, high, ice-free land, with intervening water, whereon the ice was in the process of disintegration, makes it exceedingly doubtful if a very high northing can be made on that coast, with Inglefield gulf as a base.

The endurance, determination and skill of Lieutenant Peary are beyond question and his moderate success most probable, but as to his attaining the farthest north and mapping out the north-eastern boundaries of the archipelago discovered by Lockwood his chances of success are inconsiderable, say one in ten. In any event we bid God-speed and wish entire success to the hardy, adventurous American who, having once beaten the Norwegian on his chosen ground over the inland ice of Greenland, now strives to outstrip the persistent Nansen in a race for the Pole.

A. W. GREELY.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE HOME RULE BILL.

BY THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE, K. C. M. G.

It is now practically a certainty that the Home Rule Bill will pass the third-reading stage in the House of Commons, and a very few weeks after these lines are penned the House of Lords will be called upon to play an all-important part in the political history of the century. It will therefore be of interest to many independent observers to study the question at issue in its aspect of to-day, having regard to the influences which that aspect may bring to bear upon the House while forming its decision.

It is not altogether surprising that considerable misapprehension should exist in many quarters as to the actual position and amount of authority which the House of Lords holds in the composition of Parliament. A common error seems to prevail, and it is not confined to England alone, that, for the purposes of any great constitutional or legislative change, the House of Commons is all-powerful, and that in no matter of any great moment, even though it involves a complete revolution in our mode of government, an entire and experimental reconstruction of those safeguards for the property and personal liberty of a large class of the Queen's subjects which have their foundation in the common law of the land, is its judgment and verdict to be gainsaid or questioned. The error is the more widespread, as it has of late been sedulously fostered and promulgated for party purposes, so that by its constant reiteration in various forms, either of denunciation, or threat, or warning, people have been led in many cases to believe that the House of Lords is in reality *nothing more than a chamber for the registration and approval of the decrees of the other House, the latter holding the absolute power to loose or to bind as it pleases.* But without entering into the merits or demerits of the system upon which the Parlia-

mentary machinery of the United Kingdom is constituted, let us consider the actual state of things as it stands. Parliament is of course supreme. Ours, perhaps to our misfortune, is not a Constitution of clauses; it is based upon the common law, and upon tradition, and there is no limit, save that of the patriotism and wisdom of those who rule its councils, to the powers of Parliament. But what is Parliament, as defined by authority?

"The Commons are not the Parliament, neither are the Lords, nor the Crown; but the three 'Estates,' united in their triple capacity, constitute the High Court of Parliament, and exercise the legislative functions of the realm. A Peer is as much a Member of Parliament as a Commoner; the King, Lords, and Commons in their united character exercise none but the legislative functions; taken together they are the Parliament, and there can be no Act of Parliament in which they do not concur. The power of Parliament is said to be transcendent, and subject to no limitation whatever."

As of the whole, so of the parts. There is not a word which suggests for either House anything but an equal authority, and that authority is for each and either of them "transcendent and subject to no limitation whatever." In the absence of a written Constitution we have in the independence of the two Houses the only safeguard against hasty or ill-considered legislation which might otherwise be forced upon the country, on the top of a passing wave of popular feeling, and in moments of temporary excitement, or against the absolutism of any Minister who might command an obedient majority, no matter how small, in the Lower House.

And yet it would puzzle the most inveterately hostile critic of the House of Lords to find a single case from the Reform Bill of 1832 to the present time when that assembly has hesitated to adapt itself to the will of the people, clearly and solidly expressed by the votes of its representatives in the House of Commons. It did so, to quote more recent instances, in the case of the Irish Church Act, of the Land Act of 1870 and of the Land Act of 1881, a measure, by the way, which, had it been passed in Washington, could have been annulled by the Supreme Court of the United States as an infringement upon free contract. The only occasion within the last thirty years where it refused to give way was when the present Prime Minister, in his last Government but one, endeavored to force the last Reform Bill through Parliament without a corresponding measure for the redistribution of

seats. It stood firm to the principle that extension of the franchise and redistribution must go hand in hand. The struggle was short, but sharp. A considerable amount of menace and abuse, not confined only to the rank and file of the Radical party, was showered upon the House of Lords, but it eventually carried its point, and affirmed the constitutional principle for which it was contending, amid general acclamation and concurrence.

Such being the view that has been held by the House of Lords as to the grave Parliamentary functions it is called upon to exercise, when any question of high political significance comes before it, indorsed with the approval of the representatives of the nation, we are irresistibly brought face to face with a consideration of the particular case. Is the present situation one which on the face of it permits the House of Lords to adhere to its usual attitude of acquiescence, with due regard for its prestige, its high constitutional position and its undoubted and unlimited authority? That the present issue, involving as it does a complete change in the constitution of Great Britain and Ireland, far transcends in importance any that have previously been submitted to the Upper House under similar conditions, will not be contradicted.

Between Home Rule as an abstract proposition and Home Rule in legislative form there is a wide gulf fixed, and even were it admitted, which is not the case, that a mandate went forth to Parliament to deal with the question, it can by no means be taken as applying to Mr. Gladstone's present proposals. Home Rule as an abstract proposition may mean anything, from the most limited local self-government to actual independence, but its very promoters by all their public utterances have hedged in, by anticipation, such legislative proposals as they vaguely foreshadowed with every sort of safeguard and proviso. The absolute supremacy of the Imperial Parliament and the adequate protection of minorities were to be rigidly secured, while Ireland was to have the full power of managing its own local affairs. Whatever scheme the Prime Minister may have had in his mind at the time, he kept to himself and his more intimate colleagues, and we have it on record that among the more prominent members of the Cabinet there was literally no agreement as to the basis of the expected proposals. In Lord Rosebery's estimation, the bill of 1886 was dead. "No incubator or hatching machine could revive" a project

whose condemnation Parliament had pronounced and whose fate a general election had ratified. According to Lord Spencer, "The policy of Mr. Gladstone in 1886 was still to the front," except in some small details. Such were the divergent views expressed before the general election, and it is upon the vague abstract proposition alone, coupled with the assurance of the introduction of provisions for the supremacy of the British Parliament and the protection of minorities, a subject, as Mr. Gladstone once stated, which went down to the very roots and foundations of our whole civil and political Constitution, that the verdict was pronounced, a verdict distinctly adverse in the cases of England and Great Britain. The policy of secrecy, concealment, and mystification was then more or less in its infancy, and the justification for it is to be found in a speech of Mr. Dillon's delivered on the 24th August, 1892, dealing with the universal inquiry for details then being urged.

"And I say this further, that had we yielded to all this clamor, and had we been silly and wicked enough to make these foolish and ridiculous demands upon Mr. Gladstone before the election took place, the verdict of England would probably be given, not for home rule, but against it."

This enthusiastic ally of Her Majesty's Government would appear to have permitted his zeal to carry him rather too far, for he has most effectually disposed of the doctrine of a mandate of the people to Parliament, in the case of the present Home Rule Bill. Nor can it be supposed that in casting their votes upon the general principle then before them the Electorate had in view the desirability of directing Parliament to saddle them with extra taxation to the extent of considerably more than a million and a half a year, for the purpose of enabling the Irish Nationalist party to run a Parliament of their own in Dublin at the cost and charges of the British taxpayer. Such, however, is now clearly proved to be the effect of the Home Rule scheme, and, as it involves a question relating to taxation, it is a matter in which the House of Lords has no power to make alterations or amendments upon the proposals of the House of Commons.

But we are now given to understand that the bill of to-day is based upon the former project of 1886. We have it on the authority of Mr. Gladstone, who, writing to the *Times* in November, 1890, stated "that for him to propose any measure except on the

lines which he had already laid down would be fatuity as regarded himself, and treachery to the Irish people." The material difference between the present bill, on its introduction, and the older measure consists in the question of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster. This was a detail, Mr. Gladstone told us, upon which the government had no decided or fixed opinion, but upon which it would adopt any arrangement that commended itself to the majority of the House of Commons. And yet this detail, this trivial matter, fit only for consideration and moulding into shape in committee, suggests in itself a most important modification in the principle of the scheme of 1886 by changing it at once from a provincial to a federal constitution, two entirely and wholly different things. So at the very outset, upon entering upon the discussion of the second reading, the House of Commons found itself face to face with a very serious change of front, and one which, according to previous utterances of many Radical members, and notably of Mr. Labouchere, should have been fatal to the bill. However, the principle of the original bill was affirmed by the House of Commons on the second reading. Since then we have witnessed a complete somersault on the part of the Government, both as regards the financial clauses, and the further development of the question of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, and the scope of the functions they are to be called upon to exercise in the British Parliament. Now, in the last days of the committee, not the second, but the third, home rule bill submitted to Parliament is under discussion. The original scheme of finance had to be abandoned, all the machinery contained in the first edition for the establishment of an Irish exchequer and the collection of taxes reserved to and to be created in Ireland by the Irish Executive, have gone by the board. All three matters are to remain as before in the hands of the English exchequer for a period of six years, while at the same time eighty Irish members are to be retained at Westminster, with full powers to take part in all discussions and vote upon all questions that may arise. The character of the bill is no longer final, but temporary, the right of Ireland to manage her own affairs in the matter of finance is taken away from her, the original principle of the measure has been entirely changed during the committee stage, and a mine has been sprung upon the public and Parlia-

ment, by the substitution, by a side wind, of principles entirely novel and unexpected in their nature.

“To free the British Parliament from the incubus of Irish affairs, and to make room for legislation upon subjects affecting the United Kingdom,” was not the least impressive argument adduced in support of Home Rule. Here, at least, the mandate of the people, if it ever existed, has been disregarded. There can be no hope of finality in any project in which it has been necessary to recast for the second time the original scheme of finance, and side by side with its adoption to announce the nomination of a royal commission to inquire into the whole subject. This is, in itself, an admission of the necessity of postponement, and of the impossibility of devising any solution without the fullest discussion and investigation. Even if the doctrine that the majority, no matter what its number, nature and composition may be, must prevail in the long run is correct, we have now ample proof that a majority is powerless to evolve any equitable, feasible or workable proposition under a mode of procedure which curtails free discussion. The enforcement of the closure in compartments can only result in a tinkering of the Constitution, and the creation of a state of things of which it is impossible to foresee the end or the consequences. No precedent can justify its application in the present case. The falsity of the analogy of the Crimes Act of 1887 is clear. On the one occasion Parliament was dealing with a question of administration, on the other it is treating of a radical change in the Constitution of the United Kingdom. In 1887 a powerful government with a commanding majority was resisting the obstructive tactics of a small section of the House of Commons. In 1893 a weak government, supported by a diminishing majority, is closing the mouth of a united opposition, scarcely inferior in numbers, and which claims that the all-important issues at stake shall be fully laid before the country. In this regard the closure of to-day is but the natural development of the policy of secrecy and mystification that has been faithfully pursued since 1886, and that has been stamped with the approval of Mr. Dillon. The country must be told as little as possible until the bill is through, and the House of Commons is to ratify in silence the proposals of its leader, proposals which have been and are daily liable to reconstruction, and alteration of principle, to suit

the exigencies of the moment, and to secure for the occasion as far as possible the cohesion of the heterogeneous elements of the Ministerial party. A study of a comparative table of the divisions in 1887 and 1893 from March to June will demonstrate the difference between the two cases.

Crimes Act, 1887.	Unionist Government majority.	Home Rule Bill, 1893.	Gladstonian Government majority.
March 25—Introduction of bill.	89	No division.	
April 1—First reading.....	108	April 21—Second reading.....	43
April 18—Second reading.....	101	May 15—First clause.....	42
April 28—Order for committee.	101	May 17—Second clause.....	62
May 17—First clause.....	92	June 12—Third clause.....	37
May 23—Second clause.....	132	June 23—Fourth clause.....	42
June 7—Third clause.....	125	June 28—Fifth clause.....	31
June 9—Fourth clause.....	104	June 29—Suspension of 12 o'clock rule.....	31
June 13—Fifth clause.....	114	June 30—Mr. Gladstone's clos- ure rules.....	32
June 17—Sixth clause.....	169		
June 10—Mr. Smith's closure rules.....	152		

In 1887, taking the normal majority of the Government of the day at ninety, there is a steady increase up to the time of the adoption of the closure, pointing to the determination of the House to carry the measure in the face of obstruction. In 1893, allowing that the Government commands an average of forty votes, the figures are pretty equal, though diminishing, a clear proof, with our knowledge of its composition, of the mechanical principle as applied by the majority in the present case. And this suppression of discussion by means of the closure has resulted, as events have proved, in a clear breach of faith on the part of the Government. The invariable procedure in the committee stage is to postpone the preamble of any bill, and to proceed immediately to the discussion of the clauses one by one, the preamble being reserved until the conclusion of the committee. It has happened, as was inevitable during the debate, that in the case of many amendments the Government have refused to agree to their actual wording, while recognizing the principles contained in those amendments. To make these principles clear, Ministers in charge of the bill have repeatedly undertaken to bring up words at a later opportunity in committee, words which should naturally lead to debate. A most prominent place among such amendments must be awarded to those by which the opposition have endeavored to secure a clear and adequate definition of that absolute supremacy of the British Parliament which had been distinctly laid down as vital to any Home Rule scheme during and

before the late election campaign. Various propositions were put forward with this object, and urged with the greatest force and conviction. Yet they have been invariably met by one argument—their cogency has hardly been disputed—that the place for the discussion of the question of supremacy is not the clauses, but the preamble of the bill. It is clear that no discussion can possibly take place upon the preamble, and of this the members of the Cabinet must have been perfectly cognizant while framing the form and manner in which the closure should be proposed to the House. No statement could be more deliberately made for the purpose of hoodwinking Parliament, and the bill will now leave the House of Commons with this most vital point and others of almost equal importance completely undebated. The land question alone, which has required no less than two land acts and several purchase acts to bring it to its present position, is not to be discussed at all, but is to be left in a sort of dormant condition for three years and is then to pass out of the ken of the British Parliament, which has hitherto dealt with it in all its details. In dealing with questions of such enormous magnitude and importance as those now before the country, the argument as to lapse of time can have no validity whatever, when weighed and set in the balance against the vital considerations and interests involved.

It requires more than a superficial study of events during the late electoral campaign to be able to appreciate the actual position assigned to the Home Rule question among other proposals in the Government programme, but to the careful observer there has been nothing more remarkable than the various and varying degrees of importance with which it was invested in different localities and constituencies. In many it was hardly mentioned at all, or only in the most cursory terms, in others it was put in the forefront of the battle, but in every case it was associated with one or several of the numerous items promised so lavishly in the Newcastle programme, by the mere foreshadowing of which it was confidently expected to secure a sweeping majority in the United Kingdom. The result of the general election is before us, and Mr. Gladstone and his party find themselves tied and bound by their unofficial declarations as regards Ireland, and under the imperious necessity of devoting themselves to the service of their Irish allies, who are the arbiters of their fate. These must be conciliated and kept friendly if possible, in view of

that future development of the Radical policy which is unattainable without their support. To secure this the majority in the House of Commons are prepared to carry any scheme, just or unjust, perfect or imperfect, final or temporary, with or without discussion, in the firm conviction that it will be negatived by the House of Lords. No appeal to the country will be allowed; no opportunity will be given to the constituencies to pronounce judgment upon the Government they returned to power upon false representations, until at least a few other issues can be conjoined with Home Rule for the purpose of again confusing and misleading the electorate, and concealing the most vital and important questions before it. It is the common talk of the lobby. It is admitted on all hands that the solidity of the Ministerial majority is secured by the certainty that the Upper House will reject the measure. Were it otherwise, the position would become interesting. Retributive justice might justify the acceptance of Home Rule in its present form by the House of Lords, and as a matter of party tactics such a course undoubtedly shows some advantages. But, as matters stand, the House of Lords has but one course open to it—to reject a proposal which has never received the sanction of the nation, and which its authors and supporters never intended should be passed into law.

DONOUGHMORE.

THE WEALTH OF NEW YORK.

PART I.

BY THE HON. THOMAS F. GILROY, MAYOR OF NEW YORK.

IT IS a common saying that it is impossible for a rich man to tell, or to know, how rich he is. There may be exceptions to this rule, but it is hard to see how there can be any, unless the circumstances are in some way very extraordinary. As a man accumulates property he becomes the owner of such a great variety of things that an exact and complete inventory of them all becomes almost an impossibility. Practically it is an impossibility in most cases, and even if the value of every item of his possessions on a given day could be ascertained, and all the items on the list added together, the sum obtained would not be likely to represent his wealth a week later, for the reason that the values of most things in the world are continually changing. In the case of a rich man who owns real estate to any considerable extent, especially if the real estate is improved property, it is manifestly impossible to tell exactly how much he owns, or rather the money value in the public market of what he owns, until the moment he sells it. And even if a man should sell his entire estate at a single sale, he would almost certainly have some odds and ends of personal property remaining which it would be difficult to appraise.

It is for this reason that the extent of individual fortunes is always stated in "round numbers" when it is attempted to make any statement whatever. Thus we say that So-and-So is worth a million, or a hundred thousand, as it may be—never that he is worth \$103,742.86, or any such precise sum. This being true, and it is true, with regard to even small private fortunes, it will readily be seen that it is an utter impossibility to make any-

thing like an exact statement of the corporate wealth of any large community.

The items of real estate alone are usually of such a nature that even a close estimate is impracticable. A public park, for example, is not to be appraised according to the sum of all the moneys that have been expended in purchasing and improving the ground, even if that sum be known, and it is generally very difficult to trace all the items expended in its improvement when they are continued through a series of years. Neither can a park be appraised at the sum which it would realize at public or private sale if it should be cut up into building lots, for it has a distinct money value to the corporation, outside of its availability for building sites. It affects the taxable valuation of all the surrounding property, and so, directly, affects the pocket of the taxpayer. And the same thing may be said of a bridge, or a public building, or of street pavement, or any one of the uncounted, almost countless, improvements in which the money of the corporation has been invested.

For all these reasons, and many more that will be apparent after a little reflection, it is entirely out of the question to undertake any exact statement of the wealth of a city. And when the city is one containing two millions of people, and having the accumulated improvements of centuries, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of items of perishable property that are essential to the daily management of municipal affairs, it becomes impossible to make even a general estimate of the total which will be worthy of careful study.

Nevertheless, it is interesting and valuable to consider the question of the wealth of New York city, even, although it can only be studied by partial estimates, taking no account whatever of the enormous belongings that are difficult of enumeration, and probably impossible to appraise. These belongings by themselves would foot up an amount sufficient to enrich a smaller community, but they may be left out of the present consideration, not only because of the difficulty of treating them, but because they will not be missed in reckoning up the enormous wealth of the metropolis of the Western World.

Before undertaking the estimate, it is well to recall the nature of that proprietary right which a city enjoys in its municipal property. A city, under our laws, is a corporation, char-

tered by the legislature of the State as a private corporation is chartered. It is an individual in the eyes of the law, having the right to sue and to be sued, and to hold property to an extent only limited by its power and disposition to acquire and pay for such property. But it is possessed of no sovereign power, such as is enjoyed by the State, and by the general government of the United States, to hold its property at its own discretion and will, against claimants, for it is not, as is the State, the judge of disputes to which it may be a party. Its courts are created by the sovereign power of the State, and the powers of those courts are delegated by that same power which charters the municipality. Because of this fact it becomes true that all the property of a city is held subject to execution, which may be obtained against it, precisely as it may be against any other individual. In other words, whatever it owns could be seized and sold, in satisfaction of any debt which it should contract and fail to liquidate. Consequently, the credit of a city in the money market, as gauged by its ability to borrow money, will not depend entirely on the promptness and good faith with which it discharges its obligations. It does not even depend mainly on those two important factors in the problem, for, no matter how high the personal character of a borrower may be, or how enviable his reputation for promptness and good faith, it will be difficult for him to get accommodation in the money market unless he can show available assets to deposit as security for the loan he desires. And if this be true, as it is, concerning a single individual, it is still more certainly to be predicated of a corporation. The financial credit of a community, then, depends not only on its reputation as a prompt and just payer, but in still greater degree upon the extent and availability of its visible and materialized belongings—these being an infallible proof of the way in which it has husbanded and increased its actual property.

Taking this as a test, New York is probably the richest community on earth. It is said, and, I believe, truthfully, that there is no other city that can borrow money in the open market as cheaply as New York can do. This of itself is the best practical answer to those critics who maintain, either ignorantly or in bad faith, that the affairs of the city are unwisely or dishonestly administered. There are such critics, it is true, but they are not to be found among well-informed persons who have

given any attention whatever to the real facts of the case. If the government of the city of New York were what it is asserted to be by the political opponents of the party now in power, it would be impossible to place our bonds at the low rate of interest which they command. This is almost a truism, and will appear to be such to those who have really studied the subject. There is no quicker or more accurate test of the pecuniary and moral standing of any individual or any corporation than his or its ability to borrow money at low rates.

But these assertions are easily made, and may possibly carry no weight with the reader. What, then, are the facts? It is true that a dozen years ago, long before Tammany Hall regained its prestige, New York was paying interest on its indebtedness at the rate of from four to seven per cent. per annum. In 1880 we were paying six per cent. on \$56,613,378, and seven per cent. on \$46,563,496. In other words, something like seven millions of dollars a year was spent in interest alone out of the city treasury, by the people who now denounce Tammany Hall, making a profession of denunciation, and who assume that the present city government is corrupt because Tammany is in power.

Contrast these figures with those of the present day, Tammany having now been in power for five years, and see what the contrast means. We are now getting the bulk of our money—that is of the city's indebtedness, at less than four per cent. per annum; higher rates than that being only paid on outstanding bonds that are not yet redeemable, which the owners prefer holding rather than to sell them, even at the premium which is offered for them in the market. In 1891 we had outstanding \$51,539,851 of bonds bearing only three per cent. interest, and \$14,246,137 on which the rate was as low as two and one-half per cent. And as if this were not enough to show the confidence of the financial world in our solvency, a small amount of revenue bonds redeemable at the end of the year was floated in that same year (1891) at the unprecedented rate of two per cent.

Certainly the fluctuations of the money market have, and must have, something to do with the rate of interest that must be paid by any borrower, even one of such impeccable reputation as the city of New York. It is, therefore, unquestionably true that we have to pay more at one time than at another for our money. The decrease in the average rate, however, has been steady and

How much richer are we ? It is impossible to say with even approximate exactness, but something may be said that will indicate it. In the first place we can tell exactly what we owe. That is known to a cent, and the best statement of it is the full official report issued by the Comptroller, showing that portion of the city's balance sheet on May 31, 1893. It is as follows :

[illegible]

Cash—City Treasury Account	\$1,245,034.70
Sinking Fund for the Redemption of the City Debt, No. 1	456,865.14
Sinking Fund for the Redemption of the City Debt, No. 2	442,206.88
Sinking Fund for the Payment of Interest on the City Debt	205,761.49

Total Cash	\$2,449,868.21
------------------	----------------

The city is therefore under obligations to pay about \$166,000,000, and has on hand with which to pay, either in cash or its equivalent, something over \$61,000,000. A considerable amount, however, is properly called a floating or temporary debt, being the anticipation by a few days, or weeks as may be, of money actually due to the city and certain to be paid on time. It is therefore accurate to say that in round numbers the city of New York has a debt of a hundred millions of dollars. It is, as the statement shows, a little less than ninety-nine millions.

This is by no means a trifle. On the contrary it is a large debt. Larger than it ought to be, and larger than it would have been if the government of the city had always been administered as it now is. Large as it is, however, it is not nearly as large as it has been in times past. It is smaller, by considerable, than it was, for example, at the close of each year from 1873 to 1882. On December 31, 1873, the net indebtedness (corresponding to the figures \$98,551,821.87 in the report given above) amounted to \$107,028,471.07. Just a year later, at the close of 1874, it was \$114,979,969.99. And in 1876 it reached the highest point it ever did reach, when the Comptroller's report showed us that we owed \$119,811,310.39 or \$21,259,488.52 more than the amount of the present debt, notwithstanding the great expenditures made since then for permanent public improvements which will be referred to later on in this article.

But how can it be said that a community in which the municipal debt amounts to about \$50 per capita is an enormously wealthy corporation. To answer this we have to consider two things. First, what income does the city enjoy with which to defray its expenses and discharge its obligations, and, secondly, what permanent property has it? The first of these two can be told with almost as much exactitude as the debt, though there are numerous small items which it would not be worth while to state with fulness of detail in an article like this.

The main resource of the city for such income is, of course, the direct taxation on real estate. There are also the taxes on personal property, rents, fees, water rates, licenses, interest accounts, forfeited recognizances, receipts from railroad and other franchises, fines and numerous other minor items. As the tax on real estate and personal property, however, is the principal item of its annual receipts, it is well to look into that somewhat

carefully. A table showing the yearly rates of taxation for the past eleven years is interesting and instructive.

In 1882 the rate was.....	.0225	In 1888	.0222
1883	.0229	1889	.0195
1884	.0225	1890	.0197
1885	.0240	1891	.0190
1886	.0229	1892	.0185
1887	.0216		

This rate of taxation being now steadily on the decrease (a further reduction is likely to be made for the year 1893), it is evident that either the amount of taxable property must be increasing or the incoming receipts from this source must be decreasing. The former is the truth, and to demonstrate it, it is only necessary to compare the amount of the tax levy for 1885, which was \$31,047,105.79, with that of 1892, which was \$33,224,793. This comparison serves still another valuable end in disproving the charges made by certain irresponsible political critics, to the effect that although the rate of taxation has decreased the assessments have been increased on individual pieces of property.

That such a statement is idle and unfounded appears at once on a comparison of the two last-mentioned amounts. Surely, thirty-three and a quarter millions are no heavier a burden on the city now than thirty-one millions and odd were eight years ago. This becomes self-evident when the enormous increase in property improvements is considered. The valuation last year was nearly two thousand millions—\$1,828,264,275, to be exact—and this is no more burdensome a valuation for the individual taxpayer than he has been accustomed to for many years. There are many cases, unquestionably, in which the valuation of a specific piece of property has been increased, but that occurs because the actual market value of the property has increased. This statement defies contradiction.

These are facts that are tolerably well known to most New Yorkers, and yet there may be many persons, even among our own well-informed citizens, who do not fully appreciate them.

An increase in valuation from something like \$1,300,000,000 in 1880 to \$1,800,000,000 in 1892 is certainly not due to the normal growth in value of such property as remains in the same state of improvement that it was in 1880. There is unquestionably a greater value now than there was then, even to such property as this, but the enormous increase of \$50,000,000 a year (which

is about the average) in our real estate valuation is mainly the result of the constant and extensive building operations that are in progress. New Yorkers will readily recall the tall office buildings recently erected in the lower part of the city, especially in the First Ward, and the many blocks of new and handsome residences, some of them elegant and costly, which adorn the upper districts, notably those of the Twelfth, Nineteenth and Twenty-second wards. It is because of these additions, and not because of the occasional increase in a piece of property that has benefited by the betterment of the neighborhood in which it is located, that the increased valuation has come about.

This subject, however, deserves even a more careful examination, because of the fact that political arguments are continually advanced, having for a basis the old cry of increased taxation—a cry that is not easily answered without an analysis of the whole matter, and that will not be silenced by any answer whatever, no matter how comprehensive and conclusive it may be.

THOMAS F. GILROY.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND SCIENTIFIC FREEDOM.

BY THE REV. J. A. ZAHM, C. S. C.

OURS is preëminently an age of intellectual activity. Nowhere is this activity more marked than in the domain of the inductive sciences, especially the newer sciences of biology, geology, anthropology and prehistoric archæology. During the last few decades, particularly, these branches of knowledge have been invested with a human interest that is not possessed by any of the other natural sciences. The reason is obvious. Their conclusions have a more direct bearing on the traditional teachings of Christianity, whilst their tendencies are supposed, by many at least, to be the reverse of those of faith and dogma. We are even informed that we must now choose as our guide, either Science or the Church. We cannot, it is averred, follow the teaching of both, because, we are assured, they are hopelessly irreconcilable. We are told, furthermore, that Christian believers, who would devote themselves to the pursuit of science, are necessarily so hampered by scriptural restrictions and forms of dogma that they do not and cannot enjoy the same freedom of thought in investigating nature as those who have rejected all forms of religious teaching.

This is a question that will bear examination, and if it shall appear that the impression, now so prevalent, is false and unfounded, it will necessitate a revision of views that have been so long current regarding the attitude of science towards religious beliefs. And if it shall be evinced that the Catholic, who is usually reputed to be the most enthralled by faith and dogma, enjoys the highest degree of intellectual freedom, then we may safely assume that all Christian communicants enjoy the same liberty of thought as far as revealed truth is concerned, and that

the intellectual thralldom we hear so much of is the veriest chimera.

I purpose in this paper briefly to consider the attitude of the Church towards the pursuit of science, as evidenced by the ordinary magisterium of the Pontiffs and Doctors of the Church, and by the declarations and labors of those of her children who have devoted their lives to the study of nature, and whose splendid achievements in every department of science constitute a most valuable portion of the patrimony of our race.

It is scarcely necessary to premise that all orthodox Christians deny even the possibility of a conflict between science and revelation. It is impossible that revealed and demonstrated truths should not agree, because it is impossible that God should contradict Himself. All truths of the natural as well as of the supernatural order proceed from Him, and a conflict, therefore, can never be more than apparent. It may not always be possible at a given time to show their agreement, but it can never be demonstrated that they are contradictory. It may happen, and occasionally does happen, that the conclusions of science appear to contravene certain articles of faith, but in reality the apparent discord is due entirely to misapprehension of the teachings of faith or to a misinterpretation of the facts of nature. In such cases the difficulty is but temporary and is sure to disappear with a better understanding of the facts involved.

Regarding questions of philosophy and science, that have no direct bearing on dogma, the Church has always permitted the greatest liberty of thought and freedom of discussion. We have most striking instances of this in the works of the early fathers and doctors regarding questions that long ages ago were the occasion of as much study and controversy as they are now. Among these much mooted questions were those that referred to the Mosaic cosmogony, the Noachian Deluge, the chronology of the Bible and the age of the human race.

According to the allegorical system of the Alexandrian school of which Origen, Athanasius, and Clement of Alexandria were the most distinguished exponents, all things were created simultaneously, by the fiat of Omnipotence, and the days of creation mentioned in Genesis are to be taken, not in a literal, but in a metaphorical sense. The Syrian School, represented by St. Ephrem and St. John Chrysostom, advocated the literal interpre-

tation of Genesis, and maintained that the Genesiac days were days of twenty-four hours each.

The celebrated Greek doctors, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, and his brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa, taught that matter was first created in its primal, elementary condition, and that it was afterwards, during the six days, which were understood in a literal sense, fashioned into various forms as recorded in Genesis. This opinion was subsequently adopted by the great Latin doctors, Sts. Ambrose and Gregory the Great.

What will surprise those who are wont to regard all great scientific conceptions as being of modern date, we find in the *Hexameron* of St. Gregory of Nyssa, the germs of the celebrated nebular hypothesis of Laplace. Indeed, the whole of his great work on Genesis is based on the truth of this assumption. But the masterly work of the renowned Latin Doctor St. Augustine, on the days of creation,—*De Genesi ad Literam*,—is by far the most complete and comprehensive treatise on the subject that the early Church has given us. He admits the simultaneous creation of the Alexandrians, but repudiates the Syrian and Cappadocian interpretation of the six days. Instead of days he demands indeterminate intervals of time—*volumnia sæculorum*. His interpretation is essentially the same as that given by modern exegesis, of which he may justly be regarded as the prophet and precursor. A knowledge of geology and astronomy, as now understood, would have furnished him with a key to many difficulties that in his day were insuperable. But he was aware that something was lacking to complete his view of the work of creation, and he was willing to leave to the future the development of the ideas to which he had given twenty-five of the best years of his life.

The diversity of views entertained by the various schools and authorities just named, regarding the interpretation of the Mosaic days of creation, admirably illustrates the liberty of thought which the Church has always permitted her children in matters not connected with faith and morals. The same freedom of thought and discussion has likewise been allowed regarding the Noachian Deluge, the chronology of the Bible, the age of the human race, and similar questions which come within the purview of profane science.

The illustrious Fathers and Doctors just named not only show

by their writings that they enjoyed full liberty of thought in all questions of science, but they tell us so in words that cannot be misunderstood. The angel of the schools, St. Thomas Aquinas, indicates the spirit which should animate all who treat such debatable questions as those just mentioned. "As," he says, "Holy Writ may be explained in many ways, no one should cling so tenaciously to any particular explanation as to venture to maintain it, when, by any conclusive argument—*certa ratione*—it is evident that what one thought to be the sense of Scripture is false." In the language of the great bishop of Hippo, we must always be on our guard against "the seductive loquacity of a false philosophy, and the timid superstition of a false religion."

The teaching of Popes and Councils has been one with that of Fathers and Doctors. The words of the Council of the Vatican, to go no further, are so explicit on this point as to need no commentary. "The Church," it declares, "does not forbid the human sciences to make use of, each in its own domain, their own principles and methods." In his admirable encyclical *Æterni Patris*, Leo XIII. makes the same statement in almost identical terms. "In those points of doctrine," writes the illustrious Pontiff, "which the human intelligence is able to apprehend by its natural powers, it is right that philosophy should be left to its own methods and principles and arguments, provided, however, that it do not audaciously withdraw itself from divine authority." In his encyclical on *Human Liberty* the same enlightened head of the Church observes that "It is not to be forgotten that there is an immense field for the free exercise of the activity and of the minds of men in those things, namely, which have no necessary relation to the teachings of faith and Christian morals, or concerning which the Church, without using her authority, leaves the judgment of the learned entire and free." Pius IX., Benedict XIV., and other Popes, whom it were easy to quote, if necessary, safeguard the liberty of thought of the children of faith in language equally clear and decisive.

But the Roman Pontiffs are not satisfied with words. They show by their actions, by the encouragement they have given to men of science in their researches, that they not only permit, but favor the fullest exercise of freedom of thought and inquiry. And what is more, they have encouraged this liberty of thought and investigation in matters which those not in sympathy with

the Church would have us believe she is afraid to examine, or to have examined by others. A few instances—many similar ones might be adduced—will illustrate the truth of this statement.

When Champollion's discovery of the Egyptian hieroglyphics was announced in Europe, "timid minds," says Cardinal Wiseman, "took alarm and reprobated it as tending to lead men to dangerous investigations. It was feared, apparently, that the early Egyptian history, thus brought to light, would be employed as that of the Chaldeans and Assyrians had been in the last century, for the purpose of impugning the Mosaic annals." But the then reigning Pontiff, Leo XII., did not share these fears. On the contrary, he invited the distinguished savant to prepare a work relative to the obelisks of Rome, which was printed and engraved at the Pope's expense. In referring to this matter, in a letter to his friend, Cardinal Wiseman, Champollion writes: "It is a real service which his Holiness renders to science, and I shall be happy if you will be good enough to place at his feet the homage of my profound acknowledgment."

So, too, was it when the first discoveries were made regarding Quaternary Man. The exultation of the enemies of revelation at the prospect opened up by the discovery of fossil man was indeed calculated to inspire apprehension and distrust in the minds of those who had not made any special study of geology and archæology, but, who, on the contrary, had been led to regard such studies as having a tendency inimical to the Inspired Record. Pius IX., however, like his predecessor, Leo XII., showed that far from endangering the teachings of faith such researches would rather tend to illustrate and corroborate them. This he did in a signal manner by his patronage of the eminent archæologist, Michele de Rossi, during his exhaustive investigations regarding Quaternary Man in the environs of Rome.

All are familiar with the manner in which a few years ago the present wise ruler of the Church threw open the doors of the great Vatican Library to the scholars of the world. And many, doubtless, have read the admirable letter he penned when he placed at the disposition of students and authors this unique and most valuable storehouse of knowledge. It will be sufficient to reproduce one sentence from this memorable document to prove without peradventure that Leo XIII., like his predecessors in the chair of Peter, felt that the Church has nothing to fear from the

promulgation of truth; that on the contrary he was convinced that truth, from whatever quarter—from history as well as from Egyptology and archæology—must ever be of service to religion. In referring to the necessity of truthfulness and accuracy in the pursuit of historical science the learned Pontiff declares that “The first law of history is to dread uttering a falsehood; the next is not to fear stating the truth; lastly, the historian’s writings should be open to no suspicion of partiality or animosity.”

But it may be urged that the Papal utterances just quoted were not intended to be understood literally or seriously; that the examples of the Popes, in encouraging scientific research, are no indication and still less a guarantee of liberty of thought on the part of their subjects, and cannot be so construed. Let us see.

In 1867 a memoir was read before the Congress of Anthropology and Prehistoric Archæology at Paris announcing a discovery that, it was claimed, proved beyond doubt the existence of Tertiary Man. The discovery consisted of certain flints found at Thenay, in France, which were so fashioned that their discoverer maintained that they were unmistakably the work of human hands. The members of the congress were amazed, and it requires much to surprise a modern anthropologist or archæologist. The discovery was indeed so far reaching in its significance that Biblical chronology appeared to be completely disproved, and it looked as if the truth and integrity of the Sacred Scriptures were jeopardized beyond all hope of salvation. “At last,” exclaimed infidel scientists, “one *fact*—whose meaning is unmistakable—has been adduced that is diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Bible and theologians regarding the antiquity of man.” A shout of triumph went up from the enemies of revealed truth, and the Holy Scriptures, as an inspired record, was relegated to the limbo of myths and dead superstitions.

But who was the author of the memoir that created such a sensation among scientific men; who was the discoverer of the flints that at once became the nine days’ wonder of the civilized world? He was a pious French priest. He was also a learned theologian, and at the same time one of the most accomplished archæologists in Europe. But, true scientist that he was, he was a student of facts. He accepted the facts as he found them, and was willing to let his deductions from them stand the test of

criticism. The facts, to his mind, conclusively proved the existence of Tertiary Man, and for this reason Abbé Bourgeois was, until the day of his death, Tertiary Man's most ardent and consistent defender. It was subsequently shown that he, together with the majority of the archæologists of Europe, had misinterpreted the facts in the case; that the flints he discovered were not of human manufacture, and that Tertiary Man was something entirely imaginary.

This, however, matters not. During the many years he devoted to his researches, which seemed to many to presage the certain undermining of all Scriptural authority, Abbé Bourgeois was never interfered with by his ecclesiastical superiors. He was always perfectly free and untrammelled, and never for a day, so far as the Church was concerned, did he cease to enjoy the highest degree of scientific freedom. More than this; some of his strongest sympathizers and most earnest collaborators were zealous and loyal ecclesiastics. The Catholic press of Europe was freely placed at his disposal for an exposition of his views, and he everywhere and on all occasions received from his confrères in religion that kindly consideration to which his profound science and earnest piety entitled him.

As for himself, he never for a moment experienced any doubts about the ultimate bearing of his discoveries on revelation. He trusted to the future for light, and to further and more extended investigation to clear up difficulties that for the moment were insoluble.

But startling as was the announcement made by the Abbé Bourgeois, it was not more so than the theory of Preadamites—a conjectural race of men that became extinct long before the creation of the traditional father of the human species,—that was so strongly championed by two other well-known Churchmen, the Abbé Fabre d'Envieu, and the distinguished oratorian Abbé Valroger. And notwithstanding that their theory was apparently contrary to dogma, and subversive of Scriptural teaching, these devoted sons of the Church were left completely undisturbed by ecclesiastical authority. Far from being the victims of the thunderbolts of the Vatican, they continued to the end of their lives to enjoy the fullest measure of liberty of thought and freedom of expression.

What has already been said should convince any unbiassed
VOL. CLVII.—NO. 442. 21

mind that Catholics do, of a truth, enjoy all the freedom in the pursuit of science that the human mind can demand. But in order to clinch the argument, I shall let some of the most distinguished representatives of modern scientific thought testify for themselves, as well as for their brethren in the faith.

The illustrious French chemist, M. J. B. Dumas, perpetual secretary of the French Academy of Sciences, declares in one of his admirable *Éloges* that "Faith does not kill science, and science kills faith still less."

Rosellini, the learned collaborator of Champollion, in referring to those who were raising an outcry against the discovery of the distinguished Frenchman, truthfully observes that "This truth is founded on eternal bases, neither can the envy of man deface it. And if men eminent for their piety and learning admit the new system, what has revelation to fear from it?"

Pasteur, in the beautiful discourse pronounced by him on the occasion of his reception into the French Academy, does not hesitate to declare that "If we were deprived of these conceptions,"—the truths of faith,—"the sciences would lose that grandeur which they draw from their secret relations with the infinite verities."

Baron Cauchy, the greatest mathematician of his age, who, according to one of his fellow associates of the French Institute, possessed the combined genius of Euler, Lagrange, Laplace, Gauss and Jacobin, affirms that "It is precisely because it is exact and true that the Christian religion is so eminently favorable to the progress of the sciences, and to the most noble faculties of our intelligence. . . . It is because it is exact and true that it presides at the sublime meditations of the Augustines, the Descarteses, the Newtons, the Fermats, the Maclaurins, the Pascals, the Linneuses, the Eulers, the Copernicuses, the Tycho-Brahes, the Cassinis, of all those great men of all ages, who in the contemplation of nature and of the admirable laws established by the Creator found without ceasing new motives to bless and adore the author of so great marvels. . . . I have made a profound study of the human sciences, especially those that are called the exact sciences, and I have more and more recognized the truth of those words of Bacon : 'A little philosophy inclineth a man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion.'"

The erudite historian and Orientalist, François Lenormant, a famous son of a noble sire, writes in the preface of his great work *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, 'I am a Christian, and I proclaim it loudly. But my faith is not affrightened at any of the discoveries of criticism when they are true. A devoted son of the Church in all necessary things, I claim with the more ardor the rights of scientific liberty. And from the very fact that I am a Christian, I regard myself as being more completely in the sense and in the spirit of science than those who have the misfortune not to possess the faith.'

And thus I might go on with scores of similar witnesses to the fact that none more than the Christian enjoys all the rights and prerogatives of scientific freedom.

A Christian may not, it is true, proclaim with M. Duval that "Science is the elimination of the supernatural in the explanation of natural things." He may not endeavor, like Haeckel, to replace the Creator by abiogenesis,—spontaneous generation; nor hold with Büchner that "God is only another expression for our ignorance," nor that "every science, and especially every philosophy that seeks reality instead of appearance, truth instead of pretence, *must necessarily be atheistic*." This is not intellectual liberty; it is intellectual license, as irrational as it is unscientific and unnatural. Haeckel and his school may, if it so please them, descant on "the plastidule soul," and dilate on "the potentialities of carbon;" Vogt may hold that "the brain secretes thought as the liver does bile," or that "all vital action is the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm that displays it;" Moleschott may teach that there is "no thought without phosphorus" or that "man is what he eats," but Christian men of science object to being forced to accept such vagaries as science. Some one has remarked that modern science is more dogmatic than religion. If by the term science is meant the wild theories and fanciful speculations of a certain class of contemporary scientists, the statement is perfectly just. The most dogmatic people in the world to-day are certain scientific theorists of the evolutionary and atheistic schools of thought.

The mistake is that these men reject every induction and every proposition that does not rest on the testimony of the senses. Contrary to the teachings of sound philosophy, the data of metaphysics and the truths of revelation are proscribed as extra-

scientific, or anti-scientific. A first cause is excluded from the domain of science and relegated to that of mysticism, because, say Littré and Spencer, a first cause is *unknowable*. They do not believe in the existence of a personal God, because, like Lalande, they are unable to see Him with their telescopes. With Broussais they deny that there is a soul because they have never detected it with their scalpels. They would prove the existence of a Creator by the spectroscope, as they disclose the existence of certain terrestrial elements in the sun and the stars. They look for the soul at the bottom of their crucibles and retorts, and not finding it there gravely inform us that it is a fantastic conceit which can have no place in this age of science and criticism.

This extravagant and irreligious teaching is not new in the history of science. In 1806 the French Institute counted more than eighty different theories hostile to the Sacred Scriptures that had been developed in less than half a century. Not a single one of them now remains. Since 1806 hundreds, yea, thousands, of other equally fanciful theories have been evolved, all, or nearly all, of which have been consigned to oblivion.

Not without reason, therefore, does the Apostle of the Gentiles warn us not to be "led away with various and strange doctrines." And foreseeing the dangers to which the children of the faith will be exposed, he exhorts them to "prove all things," and to "hold fast that which is good." By thus acting we exercise to the fullest extent that liberty of thought which the Church would be the last to have us forfeit. For no one, more than the orthodox Christian, is in a better position to realize in all their truth those beautiful words of our divine Master: "And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

J. A. ZAHM.

PLAYWRITING FROM THE ACTOR'S POINT OF VIEW.

BY WILLIAM H. CRANE.

WHEN an architect who has never laid a section of a brick wall shall be excluded from professional practice on account of such an alleged disqualification, it will be time to prohibit an actor from writing upon dramatic topics.

A cynical critic recently said to me that "the playwright is more likely to become an actor than the actor to become a playwright. A writer produces what he calls a play, he takes it to a manager, and the manager in due time returns it as unavailable. It is ten to one that the play has not been read. No one is bound to inflict torture on himself, and a manager of any sagacity can decide after the first few pages whether a play by a novice is worth reading; the chances being a hundred to one at the outset that it is not. Then if the writer has a little money he overrules his hostile critic in this way. He gets the piece staged at his own expense and has himself cast for a part. And although his drama is sure to fail and does fail he sometimes develops sufficient talent to secure tolerably satisfactory engagements in travelling companies in utility parts. Such cases abound. Stage life has a peculiar fascination for literary people of small calibre. The wings are full of unappreciated Shakespeares. Kept down by the tyranny and blind prejudices of managers so that their own works fail of production, they avenge themselves by murdering the works of more fortunate writers."

I am not responsible for the foregoing opinion, but it is true that the actor who has begun at the foot of the ladder and climbed up is not disposed to write plays. To begin with, he sees a vast army of unsuccessful writers constantly besieging the manager,

hungry for recognition, eager to sell their productions, or to give them away if a sale is impossible. The rewards of an acceptable playwright are liberal, but this only tends to make the army of competitors larger and to draw into its ranks an enormously large quantity of unworthy material. In a newly-discovered mining district, for every man who stakes out a paying claim a hundred or more will stake out worthless ones; and yet capitalists, and those who know, will only buy and work the good one. The actor who has brains enough to contemplate the manufacture of a play has, by the very necessity of the case, brains enough to estimate the conditions that have just been stated. And if this would not be sufficient to deter him from devoting time and labor to such a pursuit his good sense steps in and tells him that if he would retain his hold upon the public he must concentrate his faculties upon one thing, namely, his duties as an actor. As an artist he must keep himself all the time in practice. A profession is paramount to all side issues.

I am aware that I may be referred to Shakespeare and to Boucicault as exceptions that destroy this theory. Shakespeare and Boucicault were indeed exceptions, but they only prove the rule. They were distinguished playwrights—Shakespeare beyond dispute peerless, and forever located on the top-most pedestal in the Pantheon of the Drama. But he was not a distinguished actor. He went on the stage to fill vacancies and for salary, or for what amounts to the same thing, to save payments of salaries. Being part owner and manager of a theatre he might well take the latter view of the case; and it is a matter of history that he was of a thrifty turn. And even if Garrick occasionally tinkered a play, this was done from the point of view of the manager; and was mainly in the line of suggestion. The *Clandestine Marriage* comes down to us as the joint production of George Colman and David Garrick, but the editor of the *British Theatre* tells us that only the design was furnished by Garrick, and that Colman did all the writing except the prologue and the epilogue; appendages of a play which in the eighteenth century appeared to be demanded by the public. Garrick had a weakness for these literary efforts; and his good reputation as an actor has survived in spite of the wretchedness of his verses. The histrionic artist is eulogized, while we condemn, and agree to forget, the wretched doggerel that rhymes “faults”

with "thoughts" * and that labors to detain an audience impatient to leave the house at the end of the play with such verses as these :

" Abused the moderns ; talked of Rome and Greece,
Bilked every box-keeper ; and damned the piece.

* * * * *

Now, every fable has a moral to it,
Be churchman, statesman ; anything but poet."

It is a just conclusion, then, that actors will continue to act plays, and that playwrights will continue to write them ; and in reference to the latter function we may not only estimate the present condition of the American drama, but to a certain extent forecast its future.

In point of fact there never has been so prolific a creation of manuscript plays as at present. The growth more than keeps up with the increase of our population ; it seems to be more like the proliferation of germs, about which medical men have so much to say, than like the normal increase of human beings. A manager of a city theatre is agreeably surprised on a day when he does not receive a new drama at his office, with the request to read it carefully and notify the author when to expect a rehearsal, and also whether he prefers to make payment in a lump sum or by royalty. Let us estimate that twenty-five new alleged plays are finished each day by the citizens and citizenesses of the United States. Some of these are kept at home to be read to admiring friends ; others are held by the typewriter by virtue of the lien which the law allows for work, labor and service ; but the bulk of them find their way into the manager's office. They come by mail, by express, by messenger, or they are brought by the author himself, or herself. The latter method is expected to be the most effective, but managers become case-hardened even against beauty in distress.

Plays that are not typewritten stand very little chance of being read ; if in manuscript and rolled, they stand no chance whatever. To send such plays is not a gamble ; it is a sure loss of time and money. A typewritten play the sheets of which have been kept flat between stiff boards, illustrated with stage directions and occasional diagrams of position, has a fair chance of being read as far as the first few pages. By that time the manager

* Epilogue to Hoadley's *Suspicious Husband*.

knows whether or not to pass it over to his reader. There is a living chance that the reader may like it well enough to tell the manager that it might answer if it were reconstructed. Calculation fails to tell us how many plays out of a given thousand reach this point; but it would not be a bad guess to assert that if fifty new plays are produced yearly on the American stage, ten thousand have been written and submitted during that period.

The reader must not regard this as a wild surmise. When in 1891 the *New York Herald* offered a prize for the best one-act play of six thousand words, over eight hundred were sent in in face of the knowledge that the prize could be awarded to only one, and that the demand for curtain-raisers was so limited that the unsuccessful competitors could never hope to find a market for their works. The average writer who sends a three or four act play to a manager hopes for much better odds than this, and he also expects to try other managers if he fails with the first one. In fact, on receiving a play from an aspirant one's first impulse is to scan it closely in order to discover whether it has gone the rounds before, and if so, how often, and where. There are certain signs that are likely to indicate such adventures, and it is fair to conclude that if an experimentally-written play by a novice has n't been looked into and rejected many times before it comes to the hands of any given manager, it is only because he happens to be the first on the list in the possession of the author.

A manuscript play passes through numerous theatre offices before it finally is laid to rest in the morgue in the author's desk—that dreary mausoleum of so many dead hopes and aspirations—consigned to an everlasting sleep beyond all expectation of resurrection, unless some morning the writer should wake up and find himself famous, in which case various enterprising managers would discover merit in and offer money for these forgotten productions. A number of playwrights, not only in America, but in Europe, have thus after a lucky inspiration been enabled to launch on prosperous seas a variety of rebuilt wrecks that had been laid aside to moulder in the dry rot of oblivion.

Alongside of the fact that the production of manuscript plays in America has greatly increased of late years, we find the fact, perhaps unavoidable, that many more really meritorious dramas are written which only fail of commending themselves to manag-

ers because of special defects. A small worm-hole suffices to spoil an otherwise sound apple ; and a play, good in many respects, may be ruined beyond redemption by some lesion in the *motif*, some gap in the plot, some absurd aberration in the technique. A landscape purporting to be the work of a Troyon or a Van Marcke, and presenting a blue cow with pea-green horns in the foreground, would not be more ridiculous, or more hopelessly unavailable for exhibition or market, than many plays that are disfigured by incongruous and unheard-of situations, up to which the general trend of the action and dialogue have been natural and not unpleasing. Nothing is more difficult than to convince an unpractised author that his work is faulty. The well-versed playwright is quick to accept suggestions from the practical men of the stage ; he is willing to cut out and piece in, and to listen to advice ; but the tyro is deaf to such voices, because he is ignorant, and ignorance leads to stupidity.

If a hundred plays are produced now where ten were produced a generation ago, and if then there were nine bad to one good, and if now fifteen in the hundred are passably good, still the appalling fact remains that eighty-five are bad, and the inference is that the more literary activity is developed in the direction of the drama the greater will be the mass of bad plays sent in to managers. This is one of those future ills for which there is no help.

Could we arrange the productions of the coming years so that fewer worthless plays would be written, the papermaker might be a loser, but many people who might be usefully employed in honest vocations would be prevented from wasting time in composing dramas which managers will never read, and which will never see light except it be that of the kitchen fire which they will eventually help to kindle. Yet such a result can hardly be hoped. The failures of any man or set of men do not deter others no better equipped from adventuring in the same field. In the Eastern tale the aspirant for the hand of the princess was required first of all to cure her of melancholy or lose his head, and every morning a fresh head appeared on the gory battlements of her father's castle. No ambitious writer was ever kept away from his pens and paper because a thousand others were ruined by postage and express charges on their returned manuscripts.

But if, as scholars tell us, Horace wrote the "Art of Poetry" without any hope or expectation of creating good poets or reforming bad ones, but from a sense of obligation to the profession by which he earned the recognition of society and a livelihood, so may a practical actor who has had all his training in the school of the stage, hard and salutary as the rough labors, called sports, of a college campus, attempt to discharge a duty to his profession by noting some impressions as to playwriting which have been forced upon him in season and out of season upon the stage.

Prominent among these is the necessity for the possession of the dramatic instinct. This is not a matter of acquirement. It cannot be learned like the multiplication table. He who has it has it. He who has it not will labor to possess it in vain. Who teaches the bee to build the hexagonal cell? Who tells the swallow to fly south when the autumnal equinox arrives? Who instructed the wasp how to make paper for her nest out of the wood of old fence rails? Whoever answers these questions can also account for the dramatic instinct, and why a few people possess it actively and the great mass do not possess it at all.

Whoever regards the production of a play as purely a literary creation is hopelessly mistaken. The lines of a play do indeed require to be written down in order to be memorized, but it is not essential that they should be. The honest tradesmen whom Shakespeare in the *Midsummer Night's Dream* depicts as attempting to act the tragedy of *Pyramus and Thisbe*, are taught their lines by ear so that the drama might have been always vocal and never written at all, as the Homeric poems are said to have been, in their earlier days before the invention of letters. Therefore a play is not a question of literary ability employed in a given direction, nor is it a composition to be read; but it is to be seen and heard, with a bodily form and action conferred upon it by human beings.

A real drama is constructed and not written. It is built up as a house is erected by the bricklayer and stonemason, and the words are only the bricks and stones, and have the same relative value to the design of the playwright as these to the designs of the architect. The architect has the structure in existence and clearly wrought out, before the first stone is laid; and the drama of the true playwright is in existence before a word is written. Words there must be just as there must be bricks;

but as the latter can be carted from the kiln at current prices in any quantity, so can the former be brought to the playwright from the dictionary by any purveyor of sentences at current prices. The rare man who constructs a good play can hire men by the regiment to write the lines. But the dialogue; the epigram; the repartee; the brilliant speech such as we find in Congreve and in Sheridan? Is not this an essential? the reader will ask. Let us not put the cart before the horse. It is the situations that produce the dialogues; it is not the dialogues that produce the situations. Given a situation that calls for a smart, brisk, snappy, witty exchange of words, and the words will come. We see this in real life, and the stage copies real life. Even in so simple a situation as when a couple of cart-men get their wheels locked on Broadway on a muddy day and a policeman comes up to separate them, you will hear a good deal of smart though coarse dialogue. Such dialogue and all dialogue that grows out of any situation (and no dialogue worth listening to grows out of anything else) is interesting in proportion as the situation is interesting.

Without situation to call forth an interchange of language suitable to the occasion, and especially such situation as of itself interests the audience, and causes each member of it to ask himself what the characters will say next, a lot of well-dressed people might stand or sit around on the stage and fire off epigrams at each other, and the audience would yawn. Dramas, so-called, written in perfect accordance with syntax, witty here and there, and always elegant, pour in upon the manager and are rejected with the utmost energy and dispatch, because they are nothing but sermons or essays, in three or four chapters called acts. Their authors style them dramas because they are not dramatic; they divide them into acts because they involve no action; and subdivide them into scenes because where nothing is done, nothing can be seen. I may remark in passing that the old-fashioned shifting of scenes during an act is now only put into plays by novices who have not studied the modern stage.

Given, some novel, fascinating, exciting story and the dramatic instinct that throws the characters involved in the narrative into such situations as heighten the power of the incidents to move human emotions, and the literary work requisite to connect them becomes mere mechanism, as automatic as the winch that carries

bricks to the upper story of a new building. In fact, superior literary talent is not wanted. Lord Macaulay could never have written a good play ; and I doubt if he would not have spoiled a good one if he had collaborated with some born dramatist. Byron and Tennyson both failed as playwrights. Milton's *Samson Agonistes* is commended ; but you will find very few people who have ever read it once except as a parsing exercise at school ; you might safely offer a reward to any one who has read it twice ; and it is never acted. Johnson and Addison were both literary lights of the first magnitude, each a veritable Sirius in the firmament of authors, yet the *Irene* of the one and the *Cato* of the other were dead failures. Balzac confessed his inability to write a play. We might summarize the case thus, that while able constructors of situation and narrative have often put good language into the mouths of their characters and have thus contributed to literature, no literary man distinguished in belles-lettres, poetry, history or essay, has ever written a good play. May we not go further and say that he never will ? Yet we cannot make this assertion with positiveness, because there is a question of probabilities. One man in a thousand may have the dramatic instinct ; one man in a thousand may be in a superior degree literary. Then the chances are that one in a million may unite both functions in himself. Our figures are necessarily imaginary, but they indicate that such a conjunction will occur but rarely, and outside of Shakespeare we doubt if it has ever occurred.

This does not involve the assertion that a valid and useful alliance may not be made between the constructor and the writer. In fact, writing is often a drudgery to the builder of situations, whereas it is a perennial source of pleasure to the real literary man. Many of our best plays grow out of just such leagues. And during the progress of the work that is thus jointly carried on, such contentions arise as sprang up between the French and English allied forces on the day when Sebastopol was stormed. Each side magnifies his office, but the man of action wins. The literary partner aims to impress the audience with an array of ideas ; the constructive partner, the true dramatist, says : "Nonsense ; the public want action, movement, crisis ; they are satisfied with their own ideas." The latter is right and he carries his point. When you pay your money to see a horse race, you want to see two or more horses racing and not to listen to an essay on

equine physiology, even from the most learned and eloquent professor of natural history.

The tendency of the literary man, if he is a scholar, is to write over the heads of his audience, and to offend them by arrogance ; if he is a maker of stories, he expects the audience to listen to narratives and to the soliloquies with which he helps along his plot. A novel has been defined by Mr. Crawford to be a pocket drama ; but a drama is not by any means an expanded novel. The novel reader expects the author to do his thinking for him in perhaps sixty or a hundred thousand words*, off and on during a day or perhaps two or three : whereas the theatre-goer wants to form his own ideas as to certain actions that take place before his eyes in two hours and a half.

And one lesson which the dramatist must learn, without which all acquirements are useless, is that he must not be wiser than the public, nor set himself up as an instructor, a mentor, a moral or intellectual guide. A play with a purpose, constructed to teach moral lessons, without sufficient dramatic action, is a weariness whether to the boxes or the gallery, and the skilful architect of drama, even if he do convey a lesson, will not let his purpose be known. It will be his art to conceal art.

These hasty glances at a few salient points of our modern stage are but a few views at an infinitely large object ; at a few facets of an enormous diamond. As broad, as deep, as diversified as human life is the Drama ; both as to its facts and possibilities ; and rightly to construct one of these epitomes of human action, in which trivialities are omitted, and only strong and attractive incidents are dwelt upon, and so put in evidence that audiences shall merge themselves into the life of the characters, is one of the noblest and most difficult tasks ever self-set by mankind. Aside from the intrinsic difficulties of the case, the evanescent nature of all social conventionalities operates as a perpetual disappointment to the dramatist, and he realizes the full meaning of Pope's verses in relation to the fugitive themes offered by feminine habitudes :

"Come then, the colors and the ground prepare,—

* * * * *

Choose a firm cloud, and ere it fall, within it
Paint if you can the Cynthia of the minute."

WILLIAM H. CRANE.

* There are over 200,000 words in *Robert Elsmere*.

COUNTING-ROOM AND CRADLE.

BY MARION HARLAND.

A CLEVER man said a caustic thing the other day apropos to the numerous feminine enterprises represented in the Chicago Exposition. "One might imagine the fair exhibitors to be so many freaks. 'Behold!' they cry to a surprised world, 'that, *although women*, we have written books, drawn, painted and engraved pictures, edited journals, and done other wonderful works—even designed the museum in which our handiwork is displayed.'"

Without controverting or sustaining the sarcasm, the student of our times smiles at the thrust at what a lecturer of the other sex calls "The Great Awakening of the Nineteenth Century." Nobody, nowadays, talks of "the inferior sex." The weaker vessel has gone too far out of fashion ever to know renaissance at the hands of the most eccentric fancier of human faience. The emancipation dreamed of scarce a generation ago by Fanny Wright, Harriet Martineau and Lucy Stone, is an accomplished fact. Edwin Whipple, genial essayist and courteous critic, said, early in the fifties, of Elizabeth Oakes Smith's lecture upon English poetry: "What a woman can do well, she has a right to do. Mrs. Smith has demonstrated ability and right in this lecture, which is a continuous lyric."

He struck a prophetic key-note to the enlightened public sentiment of to-day. The door set wide for her who can enter in, no man can or will shut. It would be easier to enumerate the avenues of labor that remain closed to our sex than to tell over the many they are permitted to occupy. As is altogether natural, the rush into the hitherto untrodden ways reminds the observer of the headlong race of the "Forty-niners" to the Pacific El Dorado, and the ceaseless emigration cityward of restless youth

that has depopulated some of the fairest sections of rural New England.

Thought and pen are brought to a sudden halt by this last and significant illustration. Deserted homesteads and fireless hearths may be milestones in the march of progress. They may as well be beacons of warning. The homes that now stand tenantless by the score in Massachusetts townships fed the Commonwealth up to maturity of strength.

Avoiding (intentionally and scrupulously) what we speak of as the sentimental side of our subject, let us look at the bald fact that to bear and bring up children, to administer the affairs of a household upon the integrity of which depend the health, comfort and happiness of those who are to make history when their progenitors are with the forgotten dead, is a profession in itself, and an important one. Motherhood and homemaking are women's untransferable missions. Men may write her books, or paint her pictures, or conduct her financial and benevolent enterprises so well as to leave her generation nothing to regret in her withdrawal from one or all of these spheres of action. When she demits the duty of maternity the whole creation cannot supply a substitute. When children reluctantly brought into being are consigned to the companionship and tutelage of hirelings and aliens in blood, the family has no advantages above the *crèche*; home and boarding-school become interchangeable terms.

That the writer of this paper has said this, in effect, over and over again, and that other women, not to mention men, have said it yet more forcibly, proves the imminent importance of the hackneyed subject. It is evidence, furthermore, of the startling truth that many of our sex turn a deaf ear to the whispers of Nature, or are slow to learn lessons set by the observation and experience of others.

It is the deserved reproach of American girls that they are educated for anything and everything except for motherhood. Lovers of their kind are wise in raising the question in this Year of Our Lord, 1893, if it be practicable for a woman to discharge aright the offices belonging to wife, mother and housekeeper and at the same time carry on a trade or profession involving the necessity of absence from her home daily during business hours. A popular journal, conducted by a progressive woman, lately opened its columns to the free discussion of the query—

“Should business women marry?” So far as I have been able to follow the debate, the weight of opinion leans rather towards establishing the right of every woman, wedded or single, to support herself and improve such talents as Providence has endowed her with, than to the demonstration of certain stubborn truths which are patent to the candid philanthropist.

Dealing still with the practical phase of the problem, we observe that most women who resort daily to places of business as copyists, clerks or merchants, are not in circumstances which justify them in hiring efficient housekeepers, or even competent servants. The matutinal paragon of proverbial fame, who rose while it was yet night to oversee the servants’ early breakfast, was fain to prime her lord with trustworthy counsel before he took leave of her to go forth fearlessly for conference with the elders in the gate. She tarried at home to take a hand at the wool and flax-wheels, to gird her loins with strength for following the maids from room to room, and strengthen her arms by plying broom and distaff. She considered a field and bought it, and invested her private store (probably butter-and-egg money) in a young vineyard, yet looked diligently after the ways of her household, including the education of her children.

The law that formerly stood upon the statute-books of slaveholding States forbidding the sale of a child under ten years of age, unless the mother were included in the bargain, was founded in eternal justice and humanity. The birthright of every sentient thing is what old-fashioned people termed “mothering.” The word in its quaint aptness expresses a constancy of enfolding, guarding, brooding devotion which no other earthly relation makes obligatory. During most of the child’s waking hours the mother must be within hearing of the exquisite machinery she has set in motion. However engrossing other occupations may be, one side of her must be awake to call or cry; she must be ready, as a loving dictator, to encourage good and to repress wrong. The seeds of physical and moral maladies, if overlooked, will work their wicked will in the years to come, when rootlets, that are tender threads now, will be as tough as steel and defy a giant’s strength.

In a Broadwayshop window sits a man whom I have named to myself “the Lord of Shalott.” His back is to the outer world; before him is a frame filled with a neutral-tinted web. Selecting bit

by bit from a heap of colored wools beside him, he fashions slowly designs familiar to us in the oriental rugs, whose antiquity is their value, which under the tread of the centuries bloom into sheen art cannot emulate. Such is the work of the mothers of the land. In tens of thousands of homes they are weaving in hand-loom tapestry which is to outlive the stars.

Women, as a rule, are deficient in right appreciation of the laws of proportion. This partially accounts for the circumstance that, while that man has never yet been found who would change his sex if he could, many women freely avow that they wish they had been born men. The dash and excitement of combat in the open field ensnare our heroine's fancy, and belittle, by contrast, in her eyes the nicer processes that prepare the soldier for the campaign. She is not content with her craft of artificer of the weapons and instruments without which there would be no public triumphs to record.

Mothers of a different grade from that which furnishes readers of prominent Reviews, who bear their part in Congresses of Representative Women, compass the feat of bringing counting-room and cradle into harmonious coöperation, but in a fashion which their educated sisters would disdain to imitate. Behind the little shop tendered by madame or frau, and visible through the open door of communication, is the family living-room and nursery. When the baby—and there is always one in arms—refuses to lie quietly in the cradle or to sit upon the floor, the mother serves her customers with him upon her shoulder or lap. He is petted, fed and disciplined with like frank disregard of conventionalities. She is a shrewd business woman, a fond and, according to her lights, a faithful parent, troubling her brain with no fine-drawn disquisitions. The shop must be looked after, the baby is *here*! What would you? She and hers will possess this land of the Pilgrims' pride in due time.

For, side by side with feminine ambition to do a man's work in the outer world has grown the disposition to regard the advent of children in the abodes of our so-called better classes, as, at the best, an expensive luxury. They handicap the aspirant for fame; they make a mock of routine, claiming all seasons for their own; they clothe with forceful meaning the phrase "limitations of sex;" but these extremely lively stones are the material with which the Temple of the Future is to be built.

Our woman of advanced ideas must make choice between two avocations, each of which demands singleness of purpose and the best powers of mind and body. She is wise above what is written by enthusiastic leaders into what is the new world to her, and the old to her brothers, if she comprehend that the road for her must for a while lead uphill. While she is no longer excluded from the business arena, she contends there with disadvantages unknown to men. However heroic the training for her chosen career may have been, the atmosphere of the commercial, and, in a less degree, of the professional world strikes her as harsh and raw. Men's ways are not her ways; she cannot learn all at once to put her sensibilities safely out of reach; the strife for mastery shocks her ideas of the equity of reciprocal benefits; her nerves, physical and spiritual, lie too near the surface to allow her to compete upon equal terms with those who are prepared for this sort of work by precedent, birth, and physical conformation.

Women do themselves gross injustice and are unconsciously cruel to their sisters when they combat the truth of their bodily unfitness to toil after the manner of men, as many hours *per diem*, week in and week out, and throughout the year. Under the finest conditions of constitution and health a woman may be the superb counterpart of brother, lover or husband—the *alter ego*, that, combined with his personality, makes up the perfect human creature. She is not—she never will be—his faithful representation. In denying this natural law, she arrogates as her own a form of creation unknown to God and to man. In contending for the equality of the sexes, her ambition has overleaped the bounds that masculine daring has set for itself. She would unite in her one person the distinctive qualities and the loftiest possibilities of both sexes. For the Damascus blade that cuts cleanly through the down cushion, she covets the solid weight of the cleaver.

Nature, as interpreted by the sages of all ages, divides between the sexes the labor of developing the race up to its highest type. Reasoning together with a right sense of woman's worth in the vast scheme, our counsellors plead that since she, and none else, can fulfil certain duties, she cannot decline them without fatal injury to the great system. Nobody doubts her ability to keep accounts, to buy and to sell, to practise law and medicine, and expound theology. Celibate, she can engage in and carry on any of

these emprises with success contingent upon ability and opportunity. It is a simple statement of a principle as self-evident as that two substances cannot occupy the same space at the same time, that she cannot play the man in a calling which requires all her thoughts and energies for seven, eight or ten hours out of the twenty-four, and be very woman to home, spouse and children. As soon might the mainspring of a watch essay to run a corn-mill while regulating the cogs, wheels and levers to which it is adjusted.

When necessity binds upon the mother the grievous burden of bread-winning abroad and bringing up a family of young children at home, she must, perforce, submit to the maiming of one side of her life—and, with faith in Heaven and in herself, do her best. Were her children utterly orphaned, they would be dragged up after a fashion, taking their chances of ruin or salvation. If she go forth at morning unto her work, and to her labor until the evening, committing her darlings to fate and hirelings—or, if she be more fortunate, to her nearest of kin—she selects the lesser of two evils, and deserves our respectful compassion.

The fact that the demands of fashionable society are more inimical to the multiplication and growth of olive plants in modern nurseries than the nobler ambition to achieve independence or reputation by the employment of native talents, has no relevance to the matter now before us.

Every sensible spectator of the existence that has no worthier aim than display which is vulgar, and amusements that are selfish and puerile, resents comparison between the gauzy-winged ephemeron, dizzied by electric light, and her whose scorn of the traditional bondage to sex is founded in consciousness of innate superiority to the typical butterfly and also to the storied and priggish ant. She will make something of herself better and higher than either. Nothing in the texture of man's brain, when compared with a woman's, warrants the dogma that he is to be an independent being, and hers a parasitic growth. The admonition to cautious circumspection of speech and look in places where business men do congregate provokes a proud smile. "Temptations"—vaguely portrayed by timorous spinsters—simply do not exist for her. A single aim and a steadfast purpose are the lion of this latter-day Una.

Often—as breadwinner for others more helpless than herself—she has, to all intents and purposes, assumed the man's place. She has no leisure for thought that involves planning and provision for domestic needs, from her departure in the gray winter morning until she lets herself into the hall with her latch-key at evening. Craft or profession absorbs mental and nervous forces. Sooner or later, home—an empty echo of a monosyllable when the feminine element is lacking—becomes a harbor into which she puts occasionally for repairs. She is a seafarer—as all her fathers (but not her mothers) were. As a man's substitute in counting-room, shop and office, her success cannot be gainsaid. Into the manufacture of the substitute has gone all she had to give of mental and physical power. The graft has thriven lustily, but the native branches have been pruned to make room for the alien. If the result satisfy her, it is because she has unsexed herself. If longings for the shelter, the sacred joys and loves of wifehood and motherhood have survived throughout the unnatural process, she is an object of pity.

That there are many women in our own and other lands who have won distinction with pen, brush and chisel—have given to a grateful world the results of exhaustive research into the deep things of nature and of science, without neglecting one of the holy tasks devolving upon wife and housemother—relieves what may seem to be the hard sentence which we believe that Providence and experience have pronounced. She who keeps abreast intellectually with her growing boys and girls, and gives her husband cogent reason for safely trusting in her judgment and good sense, will not fall out of line with her generation. The home-life of a well-appointed household affords facilities for study and mental growth unsuspected by those who have never brought business habits into domestic practice. Servants are better, and children happier for the wise ruling that makes of the family a working community wherein individual taste and habit are consulted and scope is granted for the exercise of each, and where the highest good of all is the law of daily living.

The Presence that informs such an organization is practically limitless in influence. Time and eternity are debtors to it.

MARION HARLAND.

THE LESSON OF HEREDITY.

BY HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS, M. D., MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT
OF THE RANDALL'S ISLAND HOSPITALS.

THE scientific shibboleth of our time is heredity. The word is on everyone's tongue. Viewing a fallen fellow-mortal, it is quite the fashion to shake one's head and say, "Oh, heredity accounts for him; blood will tell." And with this formula we are accustomed to measure our fellows, much as a clerk measures cloth. And lest there should be any doubt about the method, the man of science comes to our aid. "Yes," he says, "you are quite right. Your formula expresses the universal principle of heredity. We word it a little differently, but the idea is the same. 'Like begets like' is the way we put it. It applies to every living thing in the world. Notice this bacillus, for example. Even as you observe it beneath the microscope, it divides, and two bacilli are there in place of one. This process it will continue indefinitely, under proper conditions, until there are myriads of bacilli there, but every one will be precisely like the first. The cholera bacillus never changes into the bacillus of consumption, nor that into the bacillus of diphtheria. Each produces its own kind and no other. 'Like begets like!' It is beautifully simple, unequivocally true, and of universal application."

It is little wonder that so relatively simple, so true and so sweeping a proposition has proved alluring. All universal formulæ are so. But it should not be forgotten that a seemingly simple principle may become very complex indeed, in its application. So it is here. Indeed, a stumbling-block of most alarming dimensions appears at the very outset if we attempt to apply the principle of heredity intelligently to any higher organism, in the fact

that two parents are to be considered. These parents are not precisely like one another, hence, in the nature of the case, the offspring must be either identical with one parent and unlike the other, or else identical with neither. Here theory wavers, but experience proves that the offspring always combines in some measure the qualities of both parents ; hence, that it never is precisely like either of them. What, then, becomes of the principle of heredity ? It appears that like does *not* beget like in the sense of identity ; and if "like" is only meant to convey a sense of general similarity, it is altogether too vague a principle to have practical utility.

In point of fact, however, no such vagueness exists. The seeming obscurity results partly from the complexity of the conditions and partly from misapprehension of terms. The explanation is found in the fact that heredity implies not so much the transmission of conditions as of tendencies. Speaking loosely, we often say that consumption, insanity, and heart disease are hereditary. Strictly speaking, the statement is never true. An inherent weakness or susceptibility of lungs, brain, or heart—a tendency towards disease of these organs—may be transmitted, but not the diseases themselves. And so of other conditions. The word tendencies is our open sesame. Two parents having qualities unlike and often mutually exclusive cannot transmit these qualities to their common offspring ; but they can transmit all their tendencies to that offspring, even though these tendencies be antagonistic. An organism cannot *be* two things at once, but it may *tend* to be many different things ; antagonistic tendencies within it constantly struggling for the mastery. And aided by external conditions, the tendencies at one time subordinate may at another time become dominant. Failing of such favorable conditions, tendencies may keep up an unequal and seemingly inefficient struggle throughout the lifetime of an individual, without once making themselves manifest, and yet be transmitted to the offspring with such potential force as there to become operative.

To tangibly illustrate : If one parent has black eyes, the other blue, it is evident that both cannot transmit the color of the eyes to their child. But one may transmit a tendency to black eyes, the other a tendency to blue, and according as one tendency or the other proves the stronger, the child will have black or blue

eyes. Suppose the black-eye tendency prevails for the moment—that is, for that individual. The blue-eye tendency is not eliminated; though dormant for that generation, it may reassert itself so strongly that a child of the next generation will have blue eyes though both its parents have black eyes.

Nor is this all. A tendency may remain dormant, and perhaps unsuspected, not merely for one but sometimes for many generations, becoming at last manifest again in a remote descendant. And this is as true of mental and moral tendencies as of physical. In short, the observed facts would seem to warrant the conclusion that the organism never relinquishes any tendency it has once acquired, but holds it in stock, if need be, generation after generation, awaiting a favorable opportunity to herald it forth. Only by such a supposition can we explain the commonly-observed fact of inheritance from remote ancestors, or, as Darwin termed it, atavism.

Manifestly, then, we shall greatly err if we attempt sweeping estimates of a child's hereditary tendencies from a study of its parents alone. Nor will it suffice to turn to grandparents, or even great-grandparents. Atavism assuredly reaches far back of these. But if we invoke a remoter ancestry, we shall be dumbfounded at the response. Behold them! There were eight great-grandparents; thirty-two individuals in the generation before that; then 64, 128, 256. We have reached back only to the time of the Pilgrim fathers. And still they accumulate, these unavoidable ancestors. In the tenth generation they number a thousand, omitting an unimportant dozen or two for the sake of round numbers; in the twentieth generation they are an army of a million. And this is going back only to the twelfth or thirteenth century. One need go but little further and the seemingly unassailable mathematical will name him an ancestry co-extensive with the entire population of the globe. Thus are we all proven brothers in fact as well as name. Thus is the antiquarian justified who had traced his ancestry down to the beginning of the seventeenth century, but there lost it; in truth he can scarcely have gone amiss up to that time. Seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century genealogies are for parvenus.

But behind the jest lie sober realities of the most far-reaching import. Admitting that when examined critically our computation is somewhat shorn of its astounding proportions by mar-

riages of consanguinity, the fact remains, beyond all levity, that every human being, high or low, has had within recent times a multitude of ancestors in direct line of descent. Marriages of consanguinity being, perhaps, most frequent in circles of royalty, probably the persons who have the fewest ancestors, and of whom, therefore, as we shall see presently, we should expect the least, are kings and their kith. And yet the aristocrat is wont to look down upon the plebeian because he has no ancestors ! He means, of course, that the plebeian does not know the name of his ancestors. But what does he know of his own ? Sir John Jones boasts loudly of his lineage because he knows the names of his little line of Jones ancestors for, say, ten generations back. He holds in contempt poor Smith who cannot bring documentary evidence that he had a great-great-grandfather. But has Jones at his tongue's end the records of all of the other fifteen of his own ancestors of that fourth generation whose names were *not* Jones ? I venture not. But even if he had, what does he know of that boasted tenth generation ? Why, that *one* member was named Jones. But what of the 1,023 other individuals who make up the remainder of the phalanx ? The ancient Jones may have been a very great man indeed, but he represents less than one-tenth of one per cent. of the present Sir John's ancestors of that single tenth generation. Fortunate is it for Sir John's peace of mind that he does not know the others, for it is many chances to one they were a motley crew, scattered in all parts of the globe. Not improbably, there were a few Turks and Arabs, and a Negro or two in the company, and it is not at all unlikely that a few score of them were vassals or slaves to some of poor Smith's illustrious but now forgotten ancestors of that same generation.

But whether kings or vassals matters not for our purpose. It is only important to recall that these multitudinous ancestors existed. And there they surely are, ready to be summoned at a moment's notice by the simplest computation. Making fullest concessions to consanguineous marriages—say by reducing the number one-half—there still remain more than one thousand shades to answer the roll-call of each and every individual's ancestors within ten generations past. And the principle of atavism is at hand to prove that any particular tendency of any one of these ancestors may crop out unexpectedly after being long suppressed ; nay, more,

that all the multitudinous tendencies of all these ancestors must be represented—though combined and modified—in the personality of each Smith and Jones, and X, Y or Z of to-day. An awful thought, is it not? What wonder that we poor conglomerate mortals are torn by doubts and uncertainties, and contradictory aspirations and conflicting passions? What wonder that consistency is rarest of jewels? The wonder is rather that we can manage to spin any continuous or rational thread of life at all out of such a tangle of unmiscible tendencies. “Like begets like” has ceased to be the simple principle that it seemed.

It appears, then, to use a graphic illustration, that every individual represents the apex of an inverted pyramid of descent, whose base, extending back into history, at some point coincides with the base or a sectional plane of the ancestral pyramid of every other individual of his race. Why, then, since the same principle has applied to all, are not the apices all identical? How has the principle “like begets like,” applied to a common ancestry, produced such a diversity of descendants? Heredity, unaided, can give but one answer to this question. It is because the elements of this conglomerate ancestry have not been mixed equally. In other words, because of marriages in different degrees of consanguinity. The answer is not sufficient, yet it can account for much. Let us examine it before seeking for other causes.

In the nature of the case, if men are all descended from a common stock, all marriages must be in some degree of consanguinity. But the degree may vary from the incestuous union of brother and sister, which was legalized among the ancients, or the marriage of cousins, which is the limit fixed by most modern civilizations, to the usual cases in which all trace of relationship has long since been lost. At first sight, it is perhaps not apparent why marriages in close degrees of consanguinity should be of especial significance in their bearing on the problems of heredity. But a moment's reflection will make this plain. In the first place, a consanguineous union greatly restricts the variety of tendencies of the descendants. A person whose parents are cousins, for example, has only six great-grandparents, instead of the normal number of eight; and thus, to carry the computation no farther than that generation, his aggregate tendencies are restricted in diversity by one-fourth—in itself a serious matter.

And, in the second place, certain of these restricted tendencies may be accentuated in a way that may be yet more serious. These are tendencies of the two great-grandparents in whom both lines of descent meet, and who therefore count as four persons in reckoning the child's inherited possibilities. The offspring of cousins may therefore be theoretically expected to have (1) less than the average diversity of tendencies, and (2) an abnormal instability of tendencies, due to the accentuation of certain groups. And here practical observation fully sustains theory. It is by the application of these principles that all the specialized races of domestic animals have been so rapidly developed.

This, then, I say, is the only answer which heredity alone can give as to why individuals vary in their tendencies and qualities. The answer does not seem sufficient, for to be tangible it is evident that the unions must be in close consanguinity, and it is well known that such unions are everywhere exceptional. Even barbarians go to outside families, and even to outside tribes for wives. But aside from this objection the argument contains a fallacy in that an element not accounted for by heredity alone has been introduced unwittingly. And in some respects the interpolation is of more importance than the original document. Let us look more critically. We have just assumed that every individual inherits all the tendencies of all his ancestors. If, then, all the tendencies of the race were represented in that remote common ancestry to which we are referring, and all these tendencies again were epitomized in each and every descendant, it is not apparent why it should make much difference whether a being has six great-grandparents or eight, since the two ancestors who would be doubly represented in the curtailed generation would doubly represent exactly the same focalized group of tendencies as would be represented by any other two persons. And yet we know that consanguineous unions do make a difference in practice. We have come to another stumbling block. But the explanation is not far to seek, though it lies partly outside the domain of heredity. We have said that every individual comes into the world with possibilities representing the sum of all the tendencies of all its ancestors. This formula is certainly at once correct and comprehensive. It would be a misuse of language to speak of inheritance of a tendency not represented in some ances-

tor, near or remote. But the same formula does not represent fully the personality of the same individual when he has grown to adult life, for then we must say, The sum of all the tendencies of all ancestors *plus* certain qualities developed in the present generation through contact with a definite environment. And these acquired qualities we are bound to believe, notwithstanding the dissent of a certain school of modern biologists, are represented in the sum of tendencies which this individual transmits to his progeny. It is as if an ancestral estate received additions with each generation of holders. Only it must be remembered that the additions are not necessarily improvements. There are minus as well as plus quantities in our problem of heredity.

Not only may new tendencies be thus added generation after generation, but the old tendencies may be given new significance, certain ones being developed under a fostering environment till they preponderate as they had never done in a previous generation; other tendencies being, of course, proportionately pushed into the background. Manifestly, then, this new factor of environment is a force to be reckoned with. It is the variable quantity which is introduced into the personal equation of every creature, to be considered along with the fixed quantity, hereditary tendencies. And as this variable can never be exactly the same for any two organisms in the world, it follows that no two personalities can ever be identical. Thus it appears that the diversity of individuals and of races, which is the observed condition of organic nature, has come to pass primarily through environment, not heredity. Now it is manifest why it does make a difference whether one has six or eight ancestors of the third generation, for the two additional ancestors would have brought certain tendencies that had been developed by the specific environment of their particular lines of recent ancestors, which must necessarily have varied somewhat from the tendencies of each of the other ancestors of that or any other generation. The remote or fundamental tendencies, inherited from the common ancestry far removed, would have been the same in all; the points of difference pertain to certain less fundamental, but scarcely less important, lines of special development.

And these additional tendencies, as we have seen, are not to be set down to the credit of heredity, but to that of environment. And, indeed, if we were to carry the analysis back along exactly

the same lines to include the remote ancestors and their fundamental tendencies, we should find that exactly the same arguments apply there with equal force. Time was, in the far past, when these qualities, which we now term fundamental because they are of long standing, were in their turn developing; and we are bound to believe that they also were developed primarily through the influence of environmental forces, acting on a responsive organism. In fact, all that we can know of life and mind is the reaction of a certain kind of matter to the impinging forces of its environment. In this view, the most that can be said for heredity is that it has held a kind of receptacle into which tendencies as they were developed were thrown for safe keeping. It has developed nothing, originated nothing; but it has been a most faithful Lord High Keeper of the Treasury, for it has let no single precious tendency escape when once it had been acquired.

The function of heredity, then, is the retention and transmission of tendencies. This function it performs with the most absolute impartiality. It sees to it that each quality of an individual—whether dominant or subordinate, patent or latent—is represented in the progeny of that individual. It can do no more; its mission is completed for that generation; it must leave the plastic material for the great moulder, environment. And the forces of environment come to the attack right vigorously. But they also have their limitations. Certain general characteristics of body and mind have been so ingrained in the race through persistent repetition that they can by no possibility be greatly altered in a single generation. All the tendencies of all the ancestors near and remote coincide in the direction of these qualities. The transforming power of environment must turn chiefly to those newer tendencies which have been developed in recent generations, and to a decision between antagonistic tendencies. And yet even the primordial tendencies are not altogether beyond the pale of environment, because none of them are absolutely fixed by heredity. Take the matter of stature, for example. The ancestral tendencies vary within a limit of many inches. Some ancestors have been perhaps but four feet tall, others have been nearer seven feet. But there is a strong average tendency perhaps towards a stature of between five and one half and six feet. Within these limits, environment may under ordinary circumstances decide. Nutritional conditions during infancy, childhood,

and adolescence—the presence or absence of disease at critical periods, and the like—will determine the exact stature in the individual case, just as general nutritional conditions have determined the average stature of different races of men—the Esquimaux, for example, or the Patagonians.

And what is true of the physical stature is equally true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the mental and moral stature. But the fact that the stature, physical, mental and moral is fixed at a certain limit for one individual, does not irrevocably fix the limit for the offspring of that individual. Each individual case changes the average of tendencies, of course, but it does not eliminate the old tendencies; and these old tendencies, reacting to a changed environment, may produce a very different individual result in a succeeding generation. The average results, in deviation from the old average, only assume permanence when the race is subjected generation after generation to the conditions that first wrought an individual change. The Esquimaux, for example, have come to be a race of relative dwarfs because their environment has for generations been defective from a nutritional standpoint. But no doubt atavism still holds for them the tendency of remote ancestors to larger stature, and under changed meteorological conditions they would doubtless return gradually to the old-time average. But even under conditions as they exist, environment has not changed the physical, mental or moral qualities of this race in *kind*, but only in degree. The broad synoptical outline of qualities inherited from the remote common ancestry are still the same as those of every other race of human beings in the world. It is the specific, the newer, and hence, on the whole, the less essential qualities that differ.

If this is true of different races of men, it must be far more tangibly true of the extremes of the same race, who live under conditions much less widely variable than those that separate the races. Caucasian and Esquimaux must perhaps go back millennia to find a common ancestor; but the lord of the manor and his lowliest servant have probably had common ancestors within a few centuries past. Not merely their fundamental tendencies then, but many of the more specialized tendencies are inherently the same in both. The familiar traditional tales, doubtless some of them founded on fact, of infants of beggars and princes being transposed in the cradle without subsequent discovery,

illustrate this fact perhaps as forcibly as a more sober argument could do.

If further proof were needed, one has but to turn to the records of common every-day experience, and analyze the characteristics of such representatives of the extremes of contemporary society as are personally known to him. He will find the same general physical qualities, the same general mental qualities, above all the same general moral qualities at each end of the social scale. Why? Because these general qualities have had the stamp of approval of myriads of common ancestors. The details of specialization differ widely, of course; as widely in mental and moral directions, as, for example, the unkempt beard and ragged clothes of the one differ from the waxed moustache and fashionable suit of the other. Such differences have been wrought by different recent enviring conditions, but far more significant likenesses have been retained. The lovers of Mary Ann settle their rival claims by resort to fisticuffs; the lovers of Priscilla by innuendo, or repartee, but the principle is the same. The hero of the Bowery stage overcomes the villain perhaps by blows, at least by physical prowess; the Broadway hero triumphs through more subtle and intellectual processes. But the essential thing is that in each case the hero must triumph. He may swagger with hands in pockets, or perhaps boast and swear in choicest Bowery dialect; his pathos may be, for more refined ears, suspiciously like bathos; his courage may be bravado; but always, in the intellectual eye of his audience, he must be an approach to an ideal hero, good, noble, aspiring, or he cannot receive the plaudits of even the worst audience. Why? Because we look to stage and story for ideals, and the same ideal aspirations have been inherited from remote common ancestors by both extremes of our social life.

The fact, then, is everywhere patent that heredity accounts for the sameness of our race, not for the differences. The latter are the work of environment. It is further true that it is the plan of Nature—to use for convenience sake, the old language of teleology—to avoid extremes and keep as near as may be to the happy mean through the aid of heredity. It is as if she looked with equal affection upon every tendency once implanted in a race of her creatures, and strove always to aid the tendencies that were for the moment subordinated. To accomplish this end she adopts a very simple but very effectual expedient. We ex-

press this expedient commonly in the saying that opposites attract. This means, in the light of what we have just seen, that a person is drawn towards a person of the opposite sex whose predominating tendencies correspond to his subordinated ones. By this means tendencies subordinated in one generation are reinforced and become dominant in the next ; by this means, in other words, atavism is accomplished. Note, as practical illustrations, how tall men are attracted by small women, blondes by brunettes, genius by mediocrity. It is even matter of common experience that the most virtuous young women are often fascinated by the opposite moral traits in their male associates, while, contrariwise, the most vicious of men would always choose virtuous helpmates if they could. Thus, within the ranks of any caste of society, there is a constant effort to equalize the average tendencies and bring back that hereditary balance which environment is forever tending to disturb.

A like effort in a wider way is manifest in balancing the castes themselves. For every specialized development far in one direction, brought about through a pampering environment aided by consanguineous marriages or marriages of expediency, carries its own Nemesis, in the fact that growing instability always goes hand in hand with extreme development. We noted how specialized races of domestic animals have been rapidly developed by special environment and artificial selection (corresponding to marriages of expediency), and now we have further to note that the specialized race so developed is always an unstable race as compared with the mother stock from which it has sprung. Only by a perpetually pampering environment and a selective in breeding of an unnatural kind can it be kept from reverting through atavism to the original type ; and if it is allowed to return to natural environmental conditions, it immediately does begin to return to the old-time average status—as witness the wild horse. All this, of course, is explained easily through the struggle for existence and its resulting natural selection. Now exactly the same thing occurs among human families under similar conditions. The best illustration is afforded by the uniform history of royal dynasties. Founded usually by some person who combined rare and desirable hereditary tendencies, they are perpetuated by tradition, under an enervating environment, to whose undermining influences are added the like influences of marriages of expediency and often of

consanguinity, until in a few generations the inevitable result is reached of ill-balanced offspring, often brilliant in certain useless directions, as often insane, who are unfitted to rule, and who are presently supplanted, despite tradition, by some strong offshoot of the family, or some entire outsider, whose descendants will in turn reenact the same cycle of degeneration.

In a lesser degree, this same cycle is to be witnessed in the family histories of those upper strata of society that are always prone to model after royalty. The degeneration and frequent extinction of our "oldest and best families," with the concomitant rise of new families, is an illustration within the experience of everyone. But everywhere it is the same story: through environment, primarily, are the changes wrought: through heredity—especially as exemplified in atavism—is the stability of the race maintained. These two forces are respectively the Radicals and the Conservatives of Nature. The one insures progress, the other prevents evolution from taking such strides as would lead the race to disaster.

In one sense, perhaps, we are all "born criminals," for we inherit from remote ancestors traits that if they had free play would ill accord with the customs of our modern civilization. The child who, in a moment of impotent anger, claws viciously at the face of its mother manifests an emotion no different from that with which the remote feudal ancestor fell upon his enemy and gave him battle. The proverbial cruelty of children to animals is perhaps reminiscent of those days when the ancestors of the race lived by the chase. But these are single phases of a most complex personality. The same infant that at one moment is so vicious will the next moment hold up for the kiss of the mother cheeks wet with penitent tears. The boy who feels an instinctive desire to hurl stones at a strange dog, will just as instinctively bestow upon the same dog acts inspired by regret and pity if his missile unfortunately find its mark. The two sets of emotions are antagonistic, but they are alike "instinctive." One needs but watch for an hour the conduct of a child yet so young that his deeds express instead of masking his emotions, to gain tangible evidence of that complex host of antagonistic tendencies that are battling within the budding mind. And when one realizes at its full value the fact that no one of these tendencies can, by any possibility, be altogether blotted out from the personality of that being while it lives,

he will realize, also, that such flippant phrases as "altogether good," "wholly bad" and the like have no real meaning as applied to the complex mind of man. It may be conceded, of course, that if we were to classify all human tendencies by an ethical standard into two groups, every mortal must, at a given moment, strike a balance for good or evil, though most of us, I fear, would be very close to the line at best. But in the light of heredity—of atavism—it can never be conceded that any mortal has been or can be born into the world who has not inherent tendencies that are good as well as those that are bad. From which follow the warning corollary that no mortal can be above the possibility of temptation, and the cheering one that none can be beyond the pale of hope. And this is, to me, the great lesson of heredity.

He has but poorly read the lesson who will attempt to definitely forecast the future of any human being. Only a false prophet could, in the name of heredity, deny all hope to the child even of the most depraved criminals. As it lies there in its cradle even amidst the squalor of poverty and vice, no one can deny that it is a sweet and innocent morsel of humanity; and if contemplation of its parents causes us to shudder for its future, we may obtain a vision equally valid and far more cheering by letting our mental retrospect extend to include the worthier members of a conglomerate ancestry. Of a certainty there are good tendencies as well as bad welling up into that nascent mind. Not improbably there are many evil currents sweeping in one direction nearest the surface, but rest assured there are deeper counter currents. Whether these deeper currents will ever reach the surface is a question that lies without the pale of heredity. That delightfully impartial verdict "Blood will tell" conveyed all the message that heredity could bring. But *which* blood—the good or the bad? Heredity cannot answer. The decision rests with environment. Hence the fundamental mission of all social reforms that go to the heart of things must be to so mould the average environment of civilization that in a larger and yet larger percentage of cases the good blood rather than the bad in each newest generation shall be *made to "tell."*

HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS.

VOL. CLVII.—NO. 442.

23

THE SILVER PROBLEM.

I.—A WORD TO WAGE-EARNERS.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

MUCH has happened since I tried, two years ago, in the REVIEW to explain "Money" in a way so simple that the farmers, wage-earners, and working people generally could clearly understand it. But nothing has happened which those who understand money and its laws did not expect. Indeed, those who understand these best have rather been surprised that the results of well-known laws did not sooner produce the present effects.

I again address myself to the toiling masses of the people, the farmers, mechanics, tradesmen, and all who receive stated salaries or earn daily wages, and shall try to tell them,

First: What has happened. Second: Why it happened. And, third: The Remedy.

First, then, what has happened. Let me take you back some years. The country never was so prosperous as during the decade between 1880 and 1890. Labor was never so fully employed, wages so high, or the necessities of life so cheap; the masses never earned and saved so much; never was the proportion of the combined earnings of capital and labor given to and received by labor so large, and the proportion left to capital so small. Never was the foreign commerce of the country nor its infinitely more important home commerce so great. It is probable that our successors in many future decades are to look back to the past decade as the golden age of the Republic, as far as material prosperity is concerned.

What a contrast to this picture the position of our country presents to-day. It is doubtful if a more disastrous financial cyclone ever blasted a country to such an extent in so short a time. We look now upon the mines, not only of silver, which employ comparatively few men, but upon the much vaster iron mines almost completely stopped and the coal mines greatly restricted in product. We see the woollen and cotton mills stop in New England; the blast furnaces closed throughout the South; banks and business firms failing to an extent before unknown, and hundreds of thousands of workmen idle, when before every one was employed. And while a few thousands engaged in business suffer, the sufferers among the wage-earning classes are already numbered by hundreds of thousands. The country has fallen from the apex of prosperity to the depths of industrial depression. Adversity has taken the place of prosperity; stagnation in business has succeeded activity; confidence has given place to distrust; and, as is always the case when business is disturbed, the chief part of the loss or suffering is falling, and must fall, upon the workingmen—upon the poor millions and not upon the rich few. The millionaire will cease to make money for a time, or perhaps lose some which he can well afford to spare. The business man, as a rule, will certainly lose part of his capital, but few in these classes will be beggared. Upon the millions of poor people alone will come deprivation, restricted comforts, poorer food and clothing; and upon many absolute want.

Such a disaster has come upon the country as has compelled the President to call in hot haste an extraordinary session of Congress in these startling words:

"Whereas, The distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation, which pervade all business circles, have already caused great loss and damage to our people, and threaten to cripple our merchants, stop the wheels of manufactures, bring distress and privation to our farmers, and withhold from our workingmen the wage of labor; and

"Whereas, The present perilous condition is largely the result of a financial policy which the executive branch of the Government finds embodied in unwise laws, which must be executed until repealed by Congress."

This, then, is what has happened, and answers the first part of the subject.

We now proceed to the second part, and inquire why it has happened.

In "The A B C of Money" I made a statement to which I venture now to call your attention. I said :

"In the next Presidential campaign, if I have to vote for a man in favor of silver and protection, or for a man in favor of the gold standard and a reduced tariff, I shall work and vote for the latter, because my judgment tells me that even the present tariff is not half so important for the good of the country as the maintenance of the highest standard for the money of the people."

The cloud then seen in the sky was not bigger than a man's hand, and some of my party associates did not approve of my regarding the tariff issue as relatively unimportant compared with the money question.

But I am disposed to think that recent events may have caused them to modify their opinion. I mention this not to show you that I was a prophet, for it requires no prophet to predict what was known to be certain to come, and financial men generally saw the cloud as clearly as I. It is referred to in the hope that you may be induced to hear me more patiently now, since I was right then.

Few working people know why this panic was certain to come upon us, and it is sad to say that if you had known what "Money" is, and the laws which govern it, the country would have remained as prosperous as it was during the previous decade, because you would have spoken to your Congressional representatives in a way that would have prevented them from taking the action which has plunged us all into such distress.

The reason why disaster has come is this. Up to the year 1878 gold was our only metallic currency, silver was used only for small change, and was legal tender in sums not exceeding five dollars. In 1878, however, a bill was passed requiring the Government to buy not less than two millions of dollars worth per month of silver, and to coin it into money, thus adding to our gold currency in silver, from which before we were entirely free.

"This, the dire spring of all our woes."

The Government has ever since been trying, and trying in vain, to give a value to silver which it does not possess. It has gone exactly contrary to all the other leading governments of the world. Keen observers of affairs everywhere saw that silver was being produced in larger quantities and more cheaply than ever, owing to the discovery of new mines and to im-

proved methods of mining and refining; and, therefore, that it was falling, and bound to fall in value. One government after another stopped buying and coining silver to use for money. It is nearly fifteen years since all European governments have ceased to coin silver. Our Government alone (Mexico excepted) has persisted in buying millions of dollars' worth of silver every month, and for the last two years it has bought more silver than all the mines of the country have produced; and has issued notes for this silver which it has so far redeemed in gold. When the United States began to buy and coin silver there was not a mint in Europe which was not closed against it. Every student of finance knew that if it continued to buy silver the time must come when it would be impossible for the Government to redeem all its notes in gold, because the country was losing its gold rapidly and adding every month to its notes. It was only a question of time, therefore, when the most far-seeing and prudent among financial and business men, both at home and abroad, would begin to take measures to secure themselves against the possible failure of the Government to pay its notes in gold, for if these ever were paid in silver only, this would mean a loss of probably one-half of all their funds, so a few investors at home first began to make all contracts in gold and to exchange the bonds they had bought, which were payable in lawful money, for bonds that were expressly payable in gold. People abroad who had invested their money in our country did the same, while others decided that it was safest to withdraw all their money from our country, and so the whole world looked on in surprise, and foreign governments with joy, at the attempt of our Government to bolster up silver, and quietly began to drain our country of its gold, leaving us the silver, of which we seemed so fond. We might accept silver if we chose, but gold was the only metal for them. Since our silver legislation of 1878 began to operate, as it was bound sooner or later to operate, we have exported in five years and five months, from 1888 to 1893, three hundred and twenty-eight millions of dollars in gold, and received only one hundred and fifteen millions. And you have to note that gold has been taken from us faster and faster as we added to our stock of silver; thus, in 1890, we lost only twenty-four millions; in 1891, seventy-nine millions; in 1892, seventy-six millions; and in five months of this year no less than sixty-three millions have been taken from us.

Besides this, before we unnecessarily left the exclusive gold currency we had in 1878, and plunged into buying and coining silver, and thus poisoning our hitherto pure metallic currency, we always gained and added more and more gold to our circulation, for the United States produces more than one-third of the gold of the world, and coined in six years, ending in 1878, no less than 254 millions of dollars in gold. Since we so unwisely introduced silver into our currency as money, the people and governments of Europe, who have kindly relieved us of our pure unchanging healthful gold, have also kindly allowed us to substitute for it 354 millions of dollars of blood-poisoning silver.

It may be well just here to look for a moment at the financial result of our Government's brilliant speculation in silver. The advocates of silver purchases insisted that if the Government would only purchase more silver than all the mines in the country produced, that the price of silver would rise. Now, so far from doing so, it has constantly fallen. Some of the silver bought by the Government some years ago cost 1.20 per ounce; this month's purchases were worth only seventy cents. Taking all the silver bought by the Government, at the market price to-day, the nation has lost more than one hundred and twenty millions of dollars. If the Government were to sell its silver it would lose much more. All this money has been drawn from the people to be lost in unwise speculation in a metal which all other civilized governments had been wise enough to discard. Nor was there ever the slightest reason for the Government to abandon the gold currency and adopt that of silver, for the gold currency was meeting every want and keeping the nation free from all danger of financial distrust; and especially was it placing upon other nations the risks and losses already seen to be impending from the fall in silver value.

It is, no doubt, pretty bad management to lose one hundred and twenty millions of dollars of the people's hard-won earnings. But this amount is trifling compared with the manifold greater loss that is falling, and must now fall, upon the people by the disturbance of business which has come upon the country through the introduction of silver into the currency.

The task undertaken by our Government is, as you see, to pay gold for all notes issued for silver, these notes increasing, say, four

millions per month, and our stock of gold decreasing this year at the rate of twelve millions per month. Now, any man can see that this could not go on very long. Doubts began to arise years ago, but when a new administration came into power last March of course the financial world was more anxious than ever to know just what its policy was to be, and gold, we have seen, began to be taken from us more rapidly than ever. The gold stock of the Government fell lower and lower, and at last the hundred millions of gold hitherto held in reserve was infringed upon, and a panic threatened. President Cleveland found it necessary to make a statement, which was of a highly reassuring character. But strong as President Cleveland is upon "honest money for the people," and highly as he is to be commended for his unfaltering position upon this vital question, still the shrewd financial men of the world doubted his ability to control his own party upon the money question, and so distrust continued to spread, and the entire business of the country, simply for this reason, and for no other, was shaken.

The excitement was already great when a wholly unlooked-for act of Great Britain intensified the panic. This was the closing of the mints of India to the free coinage of silver as money. From time immemorial the 280 millions of people in India have had the privilege of going to the mint and getting their silver ornaments exchanged for, or coined into, "money;" this was "free coinage"—and because of this they have always purchased silver bars with their savings, and, having no banks or any secure place of deposit in their huts, it has been their practice to go to silversmiths and have their silver fashioned into ornaments and securely welded on the legs, necks or arms of the women and children. In times of adversity, or whenever money was needed, these ornaments furnished the supply. Now this is all changed in a night. Their uncoined silver, yesterday good as "money," is to-day only worth the market value of silver as a metal; in other words, more than one-third of the value of the principal savings of the people has been swept away. What caused Britain to plunge into this drastic policy, and thus surprise India and the world, you will naturally wish to know. The reason was this: Silver had fallen till the money of India, which is all silver, had depreciated more than one-third. India owes Britain enormous sums, and has to pay so much every year to her

that the Indian Government and railways and other corporations could not meet the loss they had to incur in remitting gold. Besides this, the British army in India, about sixty thousand strong, and all the civil servants, were demanding to be paid in gold, as their families had to be maintained in Britain; the fall of silver had robbed them of more than one-third of their wages and salaries. The manufacturers of cotton and jute in India were taking the trade of Britain because they paid wages in India in silver, and wages had not risen, although paid in depreciated silver. I found in Mexico the year before last that it was just the same; the wages had not risen at all, although now paid in silver not worth more than seventy cents per dollar, facts which workingmen, and all receiving wages and salaries, should ponder. A further fall in silver was apprehended by Britain, because it began to suspect that the United States could not be imposed upon much longer, and would soon cease the experiment of trying to keep up the price of silver by monthly purchases, and hence Britain took the bold step of cutting loose from silver in India altogether, as it always had stood aloof from it at home. It fixed the gold value of the silver rupees, already coined in India, at sixteen pence, instead of the original value of twenty-four pence. This was the market value of the amount of silver in a rupee when the decision to fix a gold value was taken. But to show you how uncertain the metal silver has become, please note that within a few hours after this value was published by the Indian Government, silver dropped twenty-three per cent. below it. It was then worth only thirteen pence per rupee, making the silver in our dollar worth just fifty-two cents. This is the lowest value which silver has yet reached.

Another source of serious anxiety about the silver problem is the coming termination next year of the Latin Union, the members of which agreed to coin silver and receive it from each other upon the basis of fifteen and one-half ounces to one ounce of gold. France, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland and Greece comprise this union, and are bound to settle upon the gold basis for all their silver coinage which has found its way into any of these countries. It is estimated that Italy and Spain will have to pay France about thirty millions of dollars each, and Belgium about fifteen millions of silver coins at about double their value, involving a loss

of fifteen millions and seven and a half millions, respectively. How this is to be met by Spain and Italy is not clear, and what the future action of these nations about silver is to be is just as dark.

For all these and other reasons, the civilized world has abandoned silver, and, seeing the United States still buying it, and issuing therefor every month notes transferable into gold, it knows that the Republic can not long maintain the parity of its gold and silver currency, and hence it stands waiting for the final catastrophe, meanwhile refusing to invest in the United States, or to buy American bonds or shares abroad. Since Britain forced India to close its mints to silver there remains no mint in the world now but that of Mexico which coins silver as money, and no nation which is compelled to buy the metal and let it lie uncoined except the United States.

I explained to you two years ago that business in our day and in our country is not conducted by an exchange of currency notes, or even of gold and silver. These are used only for small petty purposes, as mere "small change." Not more than one-twentieth part of the business transacted requires these. All large transactions, which alone may be called "business," are made upon credit. Even when settlement is made the very day the exchange is made of the article sold or bought, it is still effected by a small bit of paper, which the seller is glad to take, because he can place it in a bank and get credit for it. He does not need to get it cashed in gold or silver, because for what he desires to buy he finds people willing to take a similar bit of paper from him. But, in addition to this, here comes in a vital point—most business transactions are not payable at once, the vast bulk are made upon "time." One sells, for instance, a thousand tons of pig iron and takes the note of the purchaser, payable four months hence. Another buys a hundred thousand tons of iron stone and gives the seller his note, payable four months hence. Now, the seller must know in what kind of money he will be paid and the purchaser what kind of money he is to pay four months hence. Will it be in gold, worth a hundred cents on the dollar anywhere in the world, which he can, therefore, use anywhere, or will it be in silver, worth only fifty-two cents per dollar? The Government of the United States in the Sherman Act declared that its policy is to keep all notes payable in gold or silver, as the presenter desires; but the

question with the financial man is, how the Government is to pay in gold all the notes it has issued, and is still issuing, when it is losing its gold so fast, and every month increasing its notes? The Government has to-day less than one hundred millions of dollars in gold, and is already pledged to pay in gold notes to the amount of more than eight hundred and fifty millions of dollars. The financial man everywhere knows this, and sees that if one man in eight asks for gold the Government stock will be exhausted. Is it any wonder that sensible men have lost confidence in the ability of the Government to maintain its declared policy; and, whenever confidence is lost, the vast structure of business built upon credit, which, as you have seen, embraces ninety-five per cent. of all business, falls to the ground and lies prostrate, as at present. A convincing proof of this loss of confidence is seen to-day in the money markets of Europe. In London and Paris, Berlin and Vienna, gold money can be borrowed at two per cent. The notes of business firms given to other firms at three and four months for purchases are being discounted at two and a half per cent. per annum. Similar bills in New York have been offered at twelve per cent. per annum, and even at twenty and not taken. Now, if the capitalist of Europe were only sure that the United States could, and would, keep its currency upon the gold basis, as it has promised, millions of idle money from many parts of the world would be sent to New York. It would be transferred in a few minutes by cable, and the agents of foreign houses in New York would purchase and discount these bills of good business houses, and thus relieve the pressure. It is not foreign capital only which is frightened, it is just the same with home capital. You have heard that capital is timid, but only those who have to do with it can realize how very timid it is. A deer does not scent danger half so keenly. At the very first alarm it runs like a rabbit into its hiding hole, and remains until all is quiet again. Some orators abuse capital of cowardice, but let every workman ask himself how very cautious he is, or should be, about his own small fund, and if we knew the doings of these very orators, we should likely find if they owned a mortgage that they had quietly seen that it is payable in gold. It is human nature to take care of savings, and capital all over the world is very human, and we have to deal with capital as with human nature, just as it is. It would

be a bad day for the world if men became careless of their savings. Until all doubt is removed as to the determination of the American people to maintain its currency upon the highest standard which other leading nations have adopted, there can be no relief, either from home or foreign capital, and yet there is no reason in the world why the United States should not be as prosperous to-day as it was until recently, except one. Owing to the enormous and constantly increasing amount of depreciated silver in the Treasury confidence has been shaken in the ability of the Government to pay its currency in gold, as it has promised.

You hear now and then from men who, however, are inexperienced in business matters, that our trouble arises from scarcity of "money," and that what we need is more money in the country; but I do not think there is one man of financial experience in the whole world who will not tell you that this is not so. If more "money," meaning thereby more "currency," would have prevented this panic, it could never have happened, because the Government has gone on month after month for years adding more money to the currency. We have now more circulating medium per head than any civilized country except France, and France needs more than any other nation because its people do not use banks and credit. Money, as you know, is simply the article which we use for exchanging other articles, and it is only used for the petty transactions. When a man tells you that to issue more money would increase the prosperity of the people, it is as if he told you that the larger the game bag you carry the more game you will certainly get; that the more food you eat after your appetite is fully satisfied, the stronger you will become; that the more surplus flesh you can put upon your bones, the better it will be for you. He wants you to believe that if you put your wheat in bigger bins there would be more of it; that a gallon measure can be made to hold more than a gallon. If the Government were to make 500 millions of dollars more money to-day, it would lie useless either in the Treasury or in the banks, because it would not be needed for the only purpose for which money is needed, namely, to effect exchange of articles. And this would be the case even if gold lay in the Government vaults equal to the notes printed. The national system cannot absorb more money than it can use, any more than your system can absorb more than a certain amount of food; and

if the Government keeps on issuing notes for silver month after month the depression in every department of business will deepen and widen just as the Government does so. The panic that has come upon us is the best proof of this. It is the monthly issue of more "money" ("silver notes") that is its chief cause; and note this carefully that, although more money has been "issued," there is already less in circulation than in June of last year by more than seventeen millions of dollars. It is one thing to issue "money," but quite another thing to get the business world to take it and keep it in circulation. This it is not within the power of governments to do. Whenever confidence is shaken, the more money the government puts forth, the greater is the trouble caused. The United States just now, as to its currency, is like a man too fat and full of blood, that is, he is in great danger of apoplexy. What would you think of a doctor who should tell you that the patient needed more blood in his system, when the trouble is he cannot keep in active circulation the blood which he has now. Just so with our country. There is no active circulation of money through the veins of the nation. The financial blood is stagnant. The superabundant "currency" lies almost inactive, and it already requires a premium to induce it to come forth from its vaults and circulate.

We return to the sole cause of the panic, which is that people cannot see how 850 millions of notes can be paid with less than 100 millions of gold, especially when the notes are rapidly increasing and the gold rapidly decreasing; and they begin to doubt not only the ability but the sincere desire of the United States to pay all its notes in gold, as promised. The answer to why it happened is, therefore, Confidence in our money has gone—confidence, upon which all business rests.

We come now to the third and last part—the Remedy. Knowing the cause of the disease we see for what we have to seek—the restoration of confidence. What has destroyed this we also know. It was leaving the gold currency which we had up to 1878, and needlessly entangling ourselves by introducing silver after other nations had discarded it, not because they wished to do so, but because the metal had lost steady value, and was, therefore, no longer suitable for use as money.

Now, suppose your wife and children had been upset more than once by the new and more stylish horse for which you had

exchanged the old nag and given a bonus to boot, and they could not be induced to enter the wagon again. What would you do? Would you buy another unknown horse and endeavor with it to overcome their fears and restore lost confidence? No. You would go to the neighbor with whom you foolishly traded the steady-going nag, old "Gold Dust," and trade back the new, prancing and shying "Silver Maid," and pay him a bigger bonus than you did before, and resolve never to be so foolish again. One fine morning you hitch up the old boy—old "Gold Dust," who would neither shy nor run, even if he met elephants—and you drive up to the door unseen and announce that all who wish can jump into the wagon and go with you to the circus. How many are left behind? Not one; and many a happy drive you have again, and thousands would not induce you to part with the old nag. Confidence is restored. Now, our national banking system up to 1878 was our old nag, "Gold Dust"—the envy of the world, and the best system ever devised. It never brought us into trouble; and the longer we hesitate to get back to it, the longer will it be until confidence is restored, and prosperity returns.

Although we have gone far enough to destroy confidence and bring upon the country a terrible disaster, fortunately we have not gone so far that we need to do more than stop going farther. All that needs be done is to stop further purchases of silver. But to restore confidence thoroughly this should be done in obedience to an overwhelming public sentiment. The nation should give forth no uncertain sound; it must stand as free from a suspicion of a desire to debase the currency and as resolute to prevent its debasement as the governments of Great Britain and Germany stand. This done, the rapidity with which the country will return to prosperity will surprise even those who best know its unbounded resources. With the coming of the new year, at the latest, only traces will be left of the havoc made, and next year will be one of prosperity, with labor fully employed and the farmers prosperous because of the certain demand of Europe for our surplus agricultural products, owing to the poor crops there. You know that the world is blessed with many original authorities upon the subject of finance. I should like to submit to the leaders of the various schools of finance that all should unite and go so far upon a common road as to concur in the

stoppage of further silver purchases. You may not quite understand the idea of these various parties. There is first the bimetallist, which means a man who desires an international agreement for the use of silver as money upon a certain ratio to gold, so many ounces of silver to be taken by all nations for an ounce of gold. I should like to be allowed to suggest to him that the first step that can be taken in this direction is, to show other nations that, as long as they refuse to coin silver as money, the United States "can and will fight it out on this line" with them. That she can do so is certain, because she is a producer of gold, which not one of these other nations is, and has also the power to draw gold for her exports. The bimetallist should say to Great Britain, which has done most to depreciate silver: "You will not be permitted to succeed in your attempt to close the mints of India against silver, and place upon us the heavy burden of the silver product of the world." If, as the bimetallist assumes, the use of silver as money is essential for conducting the business of the world, it is not the United States that will find this out first. Britain, in India, will be the first to discover it and to suffer, and France and Italy, Spain and Switzerland and Greece, will all have to encounter the storm before it reaches us. These nations have simply ranged themselves hitherto behind the United States as behind a bulwark, and they can and will do this just as long as we continue to purchase and use as money nearly half the silver product of the world. Stop doing so, and see how soon you will be invited to a conference. The Republic has done the inviting recently, with results most humiliating to it. Suppose our bimetallist friends stop silver purchases and decide that the next invitation must come from Europe. They may not have to wait long.

Then we have the advocate of free coinage of silver, which means a man who wishes the Government to open its mints and give anybody who asks for it silver coined into money for all the silver in bars he offers. We suggest to him that since Britain has closed Indian mints to the coinage of that metal, and there remains not one government upon earth (except Mexico, which coins but a trifle) that has not done so, it is clearly impossible for the United States to coin, at the present ratio between gold and silver, which is 40 per cent. above the value of silver, the entire world's product, and not only the annual product but all the

silver with which India and other nations would now deluge us, since all their own mints are closed to silver coinage.

The attempt to do this would drive at once every dollar of gold out of circulation and land us in utter confusion. Free coinage of silver under present conditions, therefore, cannot be obtained. The nations which have thus closed their mints against the metal must be taught by experience that their action is unwise; that the use of silver as money is necessary for their prosperity. Most of these nations are carrying heavy loads of silver; loads far greater in proportion to their wealth than the United States is yet burdened with. Further reductions in the value of silver may finally shake confidence in France and in the other nations of the Latin Union, and especially may it shake confidence in India with its enormous stock of silver, to the coined portion of which the Indian Government has just undertaken to give twenty per cent. higher value than the market value to-day. The believer in the free coinage of silver, therefore, should rejoice to see silver fall for a short time to the lowest point, because the United States could stand this, and carry its present load upon the gold basis if it stopped buying more silver, even if silver fell to one-half of its present value. But what are India, France and the other nations of the Latin Union to do if such a fall comes. The true policy of the advocate of the free coinage of silver is to give to the nations that have discarded silver a good dose of their own medicine. There is no more reason why our country should embroil itself in the silver question than in the quarrels of Europe. It is not primarily an American but a European problem, which European nations must settle if we stand clear.

There is another silver party, that which favors coinage of silver upon an increased ratio to gold upon the basis of, say, twenty ounces of silver to one of gold, instead of fifteen and one-half ounces to one, as at present; it will occur to these people that substantially this basis having been fixed by Great Britain for India, a great step forward in the attainment of their policy has been taken. There is no doubt but that this step may have a great influence upon the use of silver hereafter as money. But the advocate of more silver being put into our dollar cannot shut his eyes to the fact that this gold value given to coined silver in India is accompanied by the closing of the mints of India to all

further coinage. If the United States were to adopt the British Indian standard for silver in relation to gold, and yet differ from Britain in coining silver upon this basis, the confidence of the world could not be regained as to the ability of the country to maintain the new ratio if undertaken by the United States alone and against the whole world. It is not time for such a step, nor will it be until the world has seen the value which silver is permanently to acquire and the leading nations agree to a ratio—20 to 1 may prove too much silver in relation to gold, and in that case, the dollars coined would rapidly disappear and go into the melting pot, and we should be left without silver currency, as was once the case before in our history. On the other hand, 20 to 1 may not prove to be enough. No one can tell, and never can tell until we stop the purchase of silver not needed by the Government, and learn after testing its value in the markets of the world for some time just what silver is intrinsically to be worth. Therefore the advocate of an increased ratio between gold and silver will find in the stoppage of purchases of silver for the present the first step in the direction in which he wishes to proceed.

There is yet another party—monometallists—who, of course, will support this proposed action, for these are men who believe that it is impossible to have two standards of value; that it would be unwise for the United States to enter, even if it could, into any international agreement which rendered it responsible in any degree for the future value of any metal or anything whatever. They believe that as the United States is the principal gold-producing country, as it is the principal silver-producing country, we shall best promote our own interests by keeping ourselves entirely free, to adopt the metal which proves itself in the future most valuable and least variable as the metal to be used as money. Who can tell, these people ask, whether next year there may not be discovered such supplies of gold as will render silver the best metal for money, or that there may not be discovered another metal even better qualified than either gold or silver for money. The world has used many articles as money in its history. We know that silver became scarcer relatively to gold only seventy years ago, and that its value advanced in consequence. And what is to prevent its value advancing again? No man can tell, or even venture to predict, the future value of either gold or silver.

Monometallists think we should take a lesson from the experience of the nations of the Latin Union. These agreed years ago upon a value in gold for silver, and now they find that silver has fallen to little more than one-half the value then placed upon it. Those who coined it freely have to pay the other nations of the Union in gold. But had gold been found in greater quantities than silver the position would have been entirely reversed. Whether the other leading nations of the world can afford to go forward without reference to the value of silver as compared with gold is, they admit, very doubtful. But there is no question as to the ability of the United States to do so. We have the advantage over other nations in this matter of gold and silver, because we are the chief producers of both, and have the power also to draw gold for the necessities of life we furnish to other nations and which they must have. It would be a pity, indeed, to sacrifice this advantage. Such are the views of the monometallists.

Now I have given you a short account of all the schools of our brilliant financiers. You can think them over and choose the one you consider sound. As I never like to let anybody be in doubt as to my opinion about any public question, I wish you all to know that I believe the last school is *the right one for the United States*.

We have another silver party of stockholders in silver mines, who have no views except how to make the most out of their property, which is quite right. To these impartial minds—as far as the various schools of finance are concerned—may I suggest that it is already questionable whether the Government purchases of silver really tend now to steady and advance its value, more than the existence of such an immense amount of unused silver lying in one mass and constantly increasing serves to depress the market. The existence of a million tons of unused pig iron in the storage yards of Britain kept pig iron prices depressed for many years. It hung like a dark, heavy cloud over the market and effectually prevented recovery. I believe such is to be the ultimate effect upon silver of the unused mass held by the United States Treasury.

Even the silver-mine owners have therefore no great and decided interest in further purchases of silver by the Government, which can only add to the present stock of material lying in vaults unused

Various as you see the views of men are upon the subject of money, yet it is most fortunate that men of all opinions, I think, must see that one measure is common to all. Bimetallists, free-coiners, increased ratio advocates, monometallists have all to travel a certain distance in the same direction, which even silver-mine owners need not oppose.

After Congress has freed the Government from further purchases of silver and confidence has been fully restored, and the nation has returned to the career of prosperity which need never have been interrupted, it will then be in order, but not till then, for all parties to be heard and all views discussed. Nor need any one doubt but that the results which may soon show themselves in other countries, if we only keep still and watch, will show us our true path clearly and lead the people of the Republic to a wise conclusion.

There are rumors of changes to be proposed in the national banking system. We are threatened with a return to the issue of money by State banks. There is grave danger that there will be let loose upon the country many wild suggestions, every one of which will tend to create alarm and prevent recovery. Even if some of these are good and might work beneficially, their discussion at this time can produce nothing but evil.

The nation is in the condition of a man who has suddenly found himself beyond his depth, and is struggling in the water. This is no time to bring before him plans for a change in his conduct or mode of life, or in his diet, or clothing. The first and only business before Congress is to drag him ashore, place him where he was before, and let him quietly come to his senses.

Congress, which will have been convened ere these pages are read, should, therefore, pass a short act stopping silver purchases, and then adjourn and allow the attention of the country to be wholly given in peace, and free from exciting financial discussions, to the work of recuperation.

Should the country go further into the silver morass, then it may safely be predicted that all that has taken place to this date will be considered insignificant compared with the trouble yet to come. History teaches nothing more clearly than this—that no country can ever enjoy prosperity, if, in regard to its standard of value, confidence is lost.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

II.—THE PRESENT CRISIS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, BART., M. P.

THE recent action of the Indian Government and the probability of an alteration in the currency laws of the United States have again called attention to the present position of silver.

The English Government, acting under the advice of an able committee presided over by Lord Herschell, have assented to the change recommended by the Indian Government. What the effect of that change will be would under any circumstances be difficult to foresee, but there is still some doubt as to what the intentions of the Government really are. They have closed the Indian mints, but announced that they will give rupees for gold at the rate of a shilling and four pence. This they assume will keep the rupee approximately at that value. They have also announced their intention to "introduce a gold standard into India," but, inasmuch as rupees are still legal tender to any amount, and Mr. Gladstone stated in the House of Commons in answer to a question from me on July 21, "that it is not at present intended to issue gold against rupees," it is difficult to understand in what sense a gold standard can be said to be introduced.

In considering the problem presented by the American currency the first question is as to the likelihood of the introduction of general bimetallism. The United States Government has always, I think, attached too much importance to our action in the matter. The entrance of Great Britain into such a league would increase the demand for gold more than that for silver, because, while 38,000,000 of people in these islands would adopt partially a silver standard, 250,000,000 in India, who have now a silver standard, would adopt partially a gold one. Inasmuch however as, rightly or wrongly, so much importance is attached to our decision, it is well worthy of consideration what that action is likely to be. For my own part I must say that I see little probability of bimetallism being adopted by this country. Our currency is well adapted to our wants.

The arguments in favor of the change derived from the fluctuations in the Indian Exchange have led to, and in the opinion of the government and their able advisers, will to a great extent be met by, the closing of the Indian mints; while any

change in our standard, unless followed by our colonies, which seems unlikely, would lead to fluctuations in exchange between them and the mother country.

Another argument used by some supporters of bimetallism is the appreciation of gold, amounting, it is even said by some, to 30 per cent. This, I think, was a complete delusion. The fall in prices can be accounted for without any such hypothesis. There is hardly an article of commerce which cannot be produced and brought here far more cheaply than was formerly the case. In fact, peace and plenty, which proverbially go together, practically mean peace and cheapness. Now, however, we are told that the cheapness is merely nominal and that it is really the gold which is dear. There are other considerations which seem to me entirely to negative the idea of any such appreciation of gold as has been suggested.

At our recent Agricultural Conference it was shown from official figures that there had been a fall in the rental value of land, estimated in gold, since 1874 of 20 per cent. But if that be so, and gold has appreciated 30 per cent., what becomes of the agricultural depression? Landlords would have nothing to complain of, for instead of a fall there would actually have been a small rise. Even if the fall has been more than 20 per cent., say 30 per cent., still, if gold has appreciated 30 per cent., the real diminution is small. My own belief is that there has been a real and heavy fall in rentals, but if so there can have been no such great appreciation of gold. Consequently any proposal to tamper with the currency founded on that argument falls to the ground.

This was also the view expressed in Lord Herschell's report. The Commissioners say that in their opinion "the greater part of the fall in the gold value of silver has been due to causes affecting silver rather than to causes affecting gold, and this conclusion fortifies, and is fortified by, the conclusion to which we have already come, that the fall in the gold price of commodities is in the greater part due to causes which affect those commodities rather than to causes which affect gold." It is not, however, incumbent on us to disprove the great appreciation of gold, but for those who believe in it to prove it; and this they certainly have not done. Still it may be interesting to take a case in illustration. Much stress, for instance, has been laid on the fall in the price of wheat in our markets. Now, Mr. Atkinson has

shown that the cost and charges for the conveyance of wheat from the interior of America are 22 shillings a quarter less than they were 20 years ago. The average price of wheat for 1870-3 was 54 shillings, and if we deduct 22 this leaves 32 shillings. The average price for last year, certified in the *Gazette*, was 30 shillings, so that almost the whole fall is accounted for. Take, again, Indian wheat. Mr. Wells, in his valuable work on "Recent Economic Changes," points out that in 1881 the price in London was 42 shillings a quarter, and in 1886 31 shillings and six pence. Now, the difference in freight was six shillings and six pence a quarter; in the railway charges from, say, Cawnpore to Calcutta two shillings a quarter, and in the cost of bags, sixpence. Allowing, as we may, one shilling a quarter for loading and unloading, this practically accounts for the whole difference, and it is quite unnecessary to assume any substantial appreciation in gold.

I might go through other articles one by one. For instance, a ton of steel can now be made for half the labor and half the coal that were required twenty years ago.

On the whole, then, it seems that Lord Herschell and his colleagues were quite justified in their conclusion that the fall in the value of commodities was mainly due to economies in manufacture and in the cost of carriage, in the discovery of new processes and new sources of supply, and but slightly to any appreciation in the value of gold.

I now pass to the change proposed and must frankly say that I believe it to be utterly impossible to maintain a fixed ratio between two great articles such as gold and silver.

It has been said that the Babylonians and Egyptians did so. That was a long time ago, and I am not sure that we can accept the statement. At any rate Prof. Max Müller in the passage on which this statement is based says nothing of the kind. He said: "It has been shown that the ratio between silver and gold in the Egyptian coins was always maintained at 1 to 12½, while in Babylonia it was 1 to 13½." But it will be observed that this was the ratio between the silver and gold "in the coins." Of course that can easily be maintained. The difficulty is to maintain the ratio of value, and it will be observed that in this very passage the ratio is stated to have been, and no doubt was, different for the two countries.

Then we are told that the ratio was maintained in France up to 1874. But this was not so. The history of the French coinage from 1850 is very instructive and should be a warning to other countries. I am old enough to remember when there was an agio on the French gold. If one was travelling in France one had either to pay a premium to get gold, or to carry a cartload of silver. The coinage of gold in France fell, so that from 1841-5 it only amounted to £800,000. Then came the gold discoveries and in 1856-60 the French coined in gold the enormous sum of £108,000,000, while the silver coined fell in 1861-5 to £800,000. These tremendous fluctuations were of course most expensive and inconvenient. Neither did they as a matter of fact succeed in keeping the ratio stationary.

Lord Herschell's report pointed out :

"That from 1830 to 1845 the coinage of gold was almost replaced by that of silver, and from 1846 to 1865 that of silver again, to a great extent, by that of gold. The continuance for a few years longer of the conditions which prevailed up to 1845 would apparently have resulted practically in the entire cessation of gold coinage in France. Even as things were, the result led to the existence of an agio on gold coins."

Mr. Giffen has shown that in 1873, before the closing of the French mint, the ratio of silver to gold had fallen to 16 to 1. In fact it was their fall which compelled the Latin Union to close their mints.

If silver can be produced as we are told at two shillings an ounce does any body really suppose that it could be kept at a price of five shillings ?

Till the recent change we had a free coinage of silver in India, we have the bimetallic system of the Latin Union and the great coinage of silver in the United States. But if the United States, the Latin Union and India have not been able to maintain the price of silver, how can it be supposed that our joining them would make so great a difference ? Indeed it could make no appreciable difference unless a great part of our gold coin were driven out and replaced by silver. We have, however, already as much silver as we wish and no more gold than we want.

The total annual production of gold has fallen, while that of silver has risen from £8,000,000 to £28,000,000, or, if we estimate it at the old prices, to over £38,000,000. With such great fluctuations it seems to me impossible to maintain a fixed ratio,

especially as it must be remembered that a very large proportion of the gold and silver annually produced is used in the arts.

It has been said over and over again that, except Mr. Birch and myself, the gold and silver commissioners were unanimous in opinion that a ratio could be maintained. This, however, is quite a mistake. Lord Herschell's report distinctly stated that—

“It seems probable that the most extended international agreement would lead from time to time to the existence of a premium on either the gold or silver coins.”

The advocates of bimetallism pass very lightly over the question of the ratio to be adopted. But this is a matter of great importance. We understand that the Latin Union would agree to no ratio higher than $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. But if we were to accept such a ratio we should, in fact, be buying a quantity of their silver at twenty-five per cent. more than its value.

I quite concur with bimetallists in wishing silver to continue in use both as coin and as a standard of value. It would be a misfortune if India or China were to adopt a gold standard. But when they speak as if silver had been excluded from its monetary privileges, they forget that the majority of mankind still use silver as the standard of value. We are monometallists, not as wishing the whole world to adopt gold, but as wishing each country to have an uniform standard.

For my part I deny that the plan proposed can reasonably be called bimetallism. It is monometallism with an option to the debtor. I always wonder that bimetallists have not proposed to make the legal tender in the last resort half gold and half silver. That would be real bimetallism; but what they propose is that one party to a contract should have the option of paying either in gold or silver. That surely is not fair. Of course, they would refuse and rightly refuse to give the creditor any such unfair advantage. But then how can they reasonably claim it for the debtor.

One advantage which has made London the centre of the business of the world has been confidence felt in our standard of value. Sir Robert Peel asked once a memorable question: “What is a pound?” Foreign countries know. Who can say what is a franc or a United States dollar? Parliament is all powerful in the eyes of the law. But if they adopted bimetallism all large or

permanent contracts would contain a clause providing for payment in gold, or perhaps in silver, but specifying which.

Mr. Van der Berg, who represented Holland, speaking of the Eastern trade with which he was long and intimately associated, told the Conference that

“As to our (*i. e.*, the Dutch) foreign credits, they consist almost entirely of drafts on London and Berlin. Paper drawn on Paris and Brussels only constitutes a very insignificant amount; and why? Because we cannot be sure in advance that when our bills on Brussels and Paris fall due we shall be paid in gold, should circumstances induce us to ask for it, without submitting to a premium, to which we naturally object.”

The investments of Great Britain in foreign countries are enormous and increasing. It is estimated that they bring us in £100,000,000 a year—one fifteenth of our total income, twice the rental of agricultural land. Surely, then, we should be very unwise to make an arrangement which would give foreign countries the option of paying us either in gold or silver—in silver if it continues to fall, in gold if fresh gold discoveries should make it cheaper than the ratio agreed on. We should indeed be unwise to agree to such a one-sided arrangement.

It is often said that bankers have special interest in raising the value of the standard. But this is quite a mistake. Bankers are both debtors and creditors. The capital placed in their hands by depositors is lent out, and what their debtors owe them, they, in turn, owe to their customers. So far as their own capital is concerned, they are in the same position as anyone else who has any savings. Who are the bankers? Take the Bank of England. The amount of bank stock held by the directors is infinitesimal. It is held mainly either by insurance offices and other institutions, who again hold it for their shareholders, or by trustees, clergymen, widows and others who are content with a low rate of interest for the sake of good security. The working classes—not, of course, individually, but collectively—are the great capitalists. They own far more and their interest is far larger than that of bankers. Those who can be called great capitalists own a mere infinitesimal fraction of the property of the country.

On the whole then it seems to me very improbable that our countrymen will assent to the introduction of bimetallism.

I come now, in conclusion, to say a few words on the currency system of the United States. Much surprise has been expressed

that the silver certificates continue to circulate at the par value, notwithstanding that the silver against which they are issued is only worth about 70 per cent. It must be remembered, however, that the Secretary of the Treasury has announced the determination of the government to pay them in gold, irrespective of any fall in the value of silver. Moreover, if a country is increasing in numbers and in commerce, some increase in circulation is sure to follow; and so long as the issue of silver certificates did not exceed the increase which having regard to the state of trade, the country required, so long they would keep their value. It is possible that if circumstances, say, for instance, the repeal of the McKinley tariff, led to an improvement in the commerce of the United States, the issue of certificates might continue some time longer without evil effects. There are, however, indications that the limit has been reached. The following figures taken from the *Economist* of July 22 are very instructive :

VOLUME AND COMPOSITION OF THE CURRENCY OF THE UNITED STATES OUTSIDE OF THE TREASURY ON JULY 1:

	1893.	1891.
Gold coin.....	£80,727,000	£81,463,000
“ certificates.....	18,531,000	24,013,000
Silver dollars.....	11,406,000	12,900,000
Subsidiary silver.....	13,080,000	11,644,000
Silver certificates.....	65,297,000	61,447,000
United States notes.....	61,175,000	64,266,000
Treasury notes.....	28,132,000	8,070,000
Currency certificates.....	2,337,000	4,375,000
National Bank Notes.....	31,946,000	32,444,000
	£318,744,000	£300,622,000

Moreover, the depletion of the stock of gold in the Treasury is even more significant. The total of gold in the Treasury has fallen from £64,300,000 in 1890, to £37,700,000 in 1893, and the net gold from £38,000,000, to £19,000,000. These figures certainly indicate that, though of course if the people of the United States think it desirable, they may continue the purchase of silver, still, any further issue of notes would, under existing circumstances, still further reduce the stock of gold.

At the same time the remedy is simple, and I see no reason for the gloomy forebodings which have been expressed. Good stocks have been very unduly depressed. The Stock Exchange runs too much into extremes. When things are prosperous,

people seem to think that the good times will last forever; and when depression comes, that good times will never return.

No doubt the fall in silver necessarily depresses silver securities, and there are many companies which are in a very unsatisfactory condition. But, so far as solid securities and well-managed companies are concerned, investors will do well to sit quietly and wait for better times.

JOHN LUBBOCK.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA LIQUOR LAW.

AT THE present day the most notable instance of paternalism in government is the liquor law in South Carolina, which is the result of Populist teachings that have lately been widely disseminated in that portion of the country, and a bold attempt to perpetuate the power of the so-called Reform faction which now dominates the State, by means of a great monopoly of the liquor traffic.

For those who are not familiar with the act commonly known as the Dispensary law, the following brief explanation may be of interest: All parties are prohibited from trafficking in any distilled or malt liquor, while the State is authorized to establish dispensaries for its exclusive sale. A general board of control exercises a supervision over the business, and a chief dispenser receives supplies and fills the orders of the local dispensers in the various counties of the commonwealth. Branch or local dispensaries are established in most of the counties. They remain open from 7 A. M. until 6 P. M. daily, except Sundays and legal holidays. Liquor is sold in packages from one-half pint to five gallons. Beer is also supplied in pint bottles. The labels of most of the bottles are surmounted by the seal and motto of the State, while a palmetto tree in raised surface occupies the reverse side. No liquor is allowed to be sold to minors or habitual drunkards, nor can it be consumed on the premises where it is sold. Any stranger desiring to make a purchase must be identified and vouched for by some responsible person. He then fills out an application, stating his age, residence, the amount he desires to purchase, and the use to which it is to be put. The application being signed and attested by the dispenser or his clerk the applicant receives the liquor. Distilled liquor can only be purchased once a day by one person, but any number of applications for beer may be made during the day by the same person.

This is practically a correct statement of that piece of most unique legislation by which some thousands of citizens were on July 1 of this year thrown out of employment, their property rendered useless and their business absorbed by the State. As a means of enforcing the law in the various counties, secret spies are appointed, composing often the lowest characters in their communities, who are expected to keep strict watch for contraband traders in spirits or malt liquors, and empowered to arrest and seize the goods of all violators of the law.

The act has met with much criticism within the limits of the State, not only from the conservative Democrats, but from many within the ranks of the "Dominant Element." In truth, all who love their State and treasure

her traditions for the past two centuries deplore the day when she descended from the dignity of statehood to deprive citizens of their property and embark in the business of a retail liquor dealer. The occupation of retailing spirits may not be considered by many of us as a very honorable calling, but it was honest, at least, when duly licensed ; and while barkeepers may not be thought to be entitled to much consideration at the hands of the public, they should, in any event, be fairly dealt with. Their property, which has been rendered useless by the law, should be paid for out of the public treasury at a fair valuation.

Trade has been seriously interfered with by the liquor law and a number of large wholesale grocers and liquor dealers have moved their places of business beyond our boundaries, while there has been a considerable exodus of retail dealers who have departed, carrying their money with them. The State is fast becoming greatly involved in most vexatious litigation, growing out of the many uncertainties and crudenesses of the law. The day is not far distant when the United States Supreme Court will be invoked to pass its judgment, when it is confidently predicted by most of our best legal talent that the whole fabric will crumble into naught.

The new system is not, however, totally bad. There has been a marked decrease of drunkenness since it went into operation. In the municipality of which the writer is the chief executive officer the police have not made an arrest for drunkenness since July 1.

W. G. CHAFFEE, *Mayor of Aiken, S. C.*

THE BRIGGS CONTROVERSY FROM A CATHOLIC STANDPOINT.

JUDICIOUS and thoughtful people cannot be averse to hear a member of the Roman Catholic Church explain from what standpoint and in what particular light his co-religionists view the Briggs controversy. Two points in particular strike them as most surprising. In the indictment preferred against Professor Briggs we are told that the errors charged are fundamental, and relate, first, to the question as to the supreme and only authority in matters of faith and practice, and, second, to the question as to the inerrancy or truthfulness of the inspired word of God. The other three principal charges, or fundamental errors, as they are called, are subordinated to, or at least congenial with, the second mentioned above.

Nothing could surprise a member of the Roman Catholic Church more than the statement that, Presbyterianism having been in existence for such a period of time, the fundamental and vital question of authority should not have long since been definitely agreed upon and settled forever. And what we here say of Presbyterianism can be, we think, fitly applied to other reformed denominations. A church is necessarily a society, and what society, a Catholic asks, can, we do not say grow and prosper, but even live or exist, without that chief and indispensable element—authority? What else is there that could give cohesion and unity to the several parts whereof a society is composed? What else can make a society that one solid compact which it essentially is? Authority is absolutely necessary to the very existence, let alone the growth and progress, of any society—as necessary to it as the head is to the body. This being so, a Roman Catholic, when

he is told that the question as to the supreme and only authority in matters of faith and practice is still being mooted in a religious society of many years standing, becomes conscious that the following dilemma imposes itself: Either a so-called religious society of that nature is, in reality, no society, since it lacks the most vital element of a society, namely, authority; or else, though it is possessed of such an element, it is indeed strange that the wisest, most learned and most influential members of that society should be in such a state of doubt and hesitancy in that regard that they hotly discuss the matter among themselves, and have impanelled a jury—we should say summoned a council—unwilling to give a unanimous verdict. Supposing, according to the latter alternative, authority does exist in a society of that kind, would not the result practically prove as disastrous as in the former hypothesis?

As to the question of the inerrancy or truthfulness of the inspired word of God, are we not forcibly led to a similar conclusion, that is, the utter necessity of a supreme authority, competent to elucidate those very points of the inerrancy, truthfulness and inspiration of what is proposed to men as the word of God, and, by unappealable sanction, impose belief in, and adherence to the same? It is not enough that men be presented with the word of God, inerrant, truthful and inspired, they must moreover be possessed of an infallible means of reaching an inerrant, truthful and therefore inspired interpretation of it. For we know that the language of the Bible is not in every case so clear and self-evident to the mind of men, that all are enabled to find out its meaning at once. We know, on the contrary, that many investigations in reference thereto are doomed to be baffled, unless they be accompanied with deep study, serious knowledge of archæology, comparative philology, scientific lore, etc. How many among the busy sons of men can find time to equip their minds with such an amount of erudition, and yet, Dr. Briggs' assumptions to the contrary notwithstanding, his co-religionists maintain that the way of salvation must be sought, and can only be found in and through the Bible. Numberless, indeed, must be the perplexed and afflicted souls crying aloud: "Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof And I wept much because no man was found worthy to open the book."—*Apoc. V., 2, 4.* And even with the best qualified expounders of the sacred text when a passage of abstruse meaning must be interpreted, does it not happen that senses differing widely, nay, anon, that violently clashing conclusions are eventually arrived at? Now, if the truth investigated be one which, under pain of eternal reprobation, I am bound to believe, and the knowledge of which imposes stringent moral obligations upon me, what am I to do? Which of the two opinions shall I adopt? Shall I weigh and compare their intrinsic value? But I have neither the time nor the ability to do so? Does it not, therefore, follow that the all-wise and all-merciful Founder of Christianity, whom all denominations alike acknowledge and worship, must have given to them whom He came to redeem and save an easier and safer means of reaching the true meaning of his utterances? Yes, evidently, and that means can be none else than authority—that authority, we say, set up by Christ in His church, not only to govern it, but also to hand down the holy traditions pure and intact, and to give to the divine word its true interpretation. That authority it is, which Augustine, himself a most learned and profound expounder of holy writ, acknowledges and reverences, when he says: "*Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*"

Therefore, sifted and scanned by unprejudiced and upright persons, the system of private interpretation of the Holy Scripture is found wanting. For most men it is impracticable; on reaching its conclusions it does not definitely satisfy the mind so as to convince it that all further research after the truth is unnecessary; nor can it impart to the heart that peace without which the latter can never be at rest. What remains then? What else than the acknowledgement of, and submission to, a supreme authority, empowered to interpret the word of God with infallible assurance. That this conclusion should not yet have been arrived at, that the absolute necessity of a supreme authority to decide on the inerrancy and truthfulness of the inspired word of God, and to interpret the same, should not yet have become manifest to all adherents of Presbyterianism, or that they should still be seeking where that authority is to be found, in whom it is vested—is, we repeat, a cause of singular surprise to a Roman Catholic.

But let us, for the sake of argument, concede that the system of private interpretation is practicable, available, indeed, the only true, reasonable and authorized mode of interpreting the word of God, shall the position held by the General Assembly in the Briggs controversy appear more tenable? Far from it, and this is at the very first glance obvious. The right to private interpretation means that each private individual is entitled to give to any passage, text, or word the significance which his own judgment may dictate, and that he may safely adopt the conclusion which, by using that standard, he has eventually reached; else the words are void of meaning. We suppose that Dr. Briggs is no more to be debarred from the full enjoyment of that right than any other minister of his own denomination. We admit that his inferences and teachings are of a somewhat startling character—maintaining, as he does, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch; that Isaiah did not write more than half his book; that sanctification is not complete after death. But what of all this, and why should Dr. Briggs be singled out, summoned before his peers, convicted of heresy and eventually suspended for believing and teaching as he does, if, in accordance with the doctrine and by the gift of his own church, he has a right to attach to scriptural writings whatever meaning his own private judgment may suggest? Whether he has made a more lavish use of that right than other Presbyterians are wont to do, is merely a question of more or less; the question of principle and right remains the same. For, after all, the case is simply this: We have before us a minister of the Gospel belonging to a church which holds as one of its essential tenets that all its members, shepherd and flock, are vested with the unlimited right to interpret the Bible in the manner which to them seems good and proper. This same minister is conscious of the fact that by using this right he violates no law, no rule of his church; that, on the contrary, he is acting in conformity with its spirit and its views; and lo and behold! when on a certain day he sets forth his own interpretations of the divine word, he is pointed out as a dangerous man, made the victim of obloquy, dragged from one tribunal to another, eventually condemned and suspended as guilty of heresy. Thus rebuked and sentenced for doing that which he was taught and told it was his right to do, Dr. Briggs may well wonder at the course followed by his self-appointed judges, and exclaim: “Consistency, thou art a jewel.” We are not surprised that Dr. Briggs should, after hearing of the sentence pronounced against him, have appeared quite unconcerned and told his friends that he “would go right on.” And we deem the course of the

minority in the General Assembly quite natural, when "declaring their hearty belief in a love for the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and their entire loyalty to the principles of the Presbyterian Church, they desire respectfully to record their solemn protest against the verdict and judgment of suspension, and the proceedings leading to the verdict, in the case against the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., in the General Assembly of 1893." Yes, if the right to private interpretation exists in the Presbyterian Church, and if words bear with them the meaning which they are intended to convey, the Briggs trial was a farce and the sentence passed upon the man a piece of iniquity.

These remarks concerning the free interpretation of the Bible and the case of Dr. Briggs have been made merely for the sake of argument; for a Roman Catholic believes and maintains that the system of individual interpretation of the divine word, with all its intrinsic absurdities, practical difficulties and baleful consequences, cannot be adopted or advocated by any man of upright judgment, and that it can, consequently, never have been handed down or sanctioned by the Founder of Christianity. Just as the safe keeping of the Holy Scriptures has been intrusted by Christ to His church, so must there be in that same church of His an infallible means to unravel all intricacies and to illustrate all sayings of recon-dite significance contained in those sacred books. That means is the teaching as well as governing authority set up in the church by its Founder. The very conclusions whereto we should be forcibly led by the contrary doctrine is sufficient proof that the Catholic belief in this regard is the only one deserving of respect and support. For who shall give to every man the time, the acumen, the knowledge required to arrive at the true meaning of certain difficult passages of the Holy Scriptures? Who shall tell a man that his interpretation of this or that text is the true one? And if, as in the case of Dr. Briggs, a conflict arise between two or more persons attributing different senses to some biblical expression, who shall decide the question? The local Presbytery or the General Assembly? But how could they thus tamper with the right to private interpretation vested in each of the wrangling parties? It is evident, therefore, that an absolute, supreme teaching authority must have been deputed by Christ to His church, that to this authority must be referred all difficulties met with in the interpretation of the sacred text, and that all the members of the church must consider the decision arrived at by that same authority as final and binding. Such is the Catholic belief, and we leave it for any sensible reader to say whether or not it is the only reasonable one. Authority in these matters of such serious import is so obviously necessary that all in practice recognize it and follow its dictates. The child, whether reared in the Catholic faith or not, receives the interpretation given him by his parents, and, later on, the man follows the teachings of his pastor. Why? Because this is for all the readiest, most natural and, generally speaking, the only practicable way of learning and understanding the Holy Scriptures.

L. A. NOLIN, O. M. I., LL. D.

NEEDED PRISON REFORMS.

OUR laws punish a man who does not support his family, by shutting him up and confiscating his earnings. What an amazing absurdity! But it is little more so than the persistence with which we cling to the prison systems of past centuries. Compulsory labor for the State is a species of slavery. It inevitably makes bad men worse. The convict's bitterness is

intensified by the knowledge that while he is earning money for the State, which needs nothing, his family is starving. Every man toiling for those he loves is ennobled by his labor. If this was the only argument in favor of the State paying the convict's wages to his family, it would be sufficient to justify such a law.

The State should pay to the families or dependent relatives of its convicts the same wages that similar labor costs private parties. Where there are no dependent relatives the wages should be paid partly to the poor fund of the county which paid the cost of conviction and partly to the convict at his discharge. The suffering a criminal endures from the loss of his liberty and remorse for his sin is a necessary part of his penalty. Not so the greater pain he feels on account of the destitution of his family, left without means of support on account of his confinement.

A criminal should never be punished in a spirit of retaliation, or beyond what is necessary for the protection of society. Every convict has all the rights ever his, except those taken away by sentence of the court, and those which, if allowed him, would render the execution of his sentence impossible. The law of Moses put the wife and children to death with the capital criminal. We think this was barbarous. What shall be said of our treatment of such? We confiscate the wages of the bread-winner of the family, and then with scornful hand dole out a bare subsistence to those we have robbed of their all. By such injustice we cause his children to hate society and become criminals for revenge.

Many men are moved by an economic argument who are indifferent to a moral one. Let these consider the expense of our present system. In a vast majority of cases the families of convicts are left destitute and become a public charge. It is probable that 90 per cent. of all the crimes for which men are sent to prison are traceable to alcoholism. It seems as if all must agree that such criminals should be placed in a reformatory and made to support their families by their labor. And that they should be released upon parole only, and returned as often as they get drunk or squander their wages upon drink. What a saving to taxpayers such a law would prove!

In estimating the cost of our prisons, it would be a gross mistake to only reckon the amount of money used. If taxes were the only consideration, it would be cheaper to support all convicts in idleness than to place them in competition with free labor. Labor is the true wealth of the State. For the State to pay the expenses of its prisons with labor is to pay them with the most valuable thing she possesses. To deprive citizens of the opportunity to labor by State competition is suicide. Suppose a State had a sufficient number of convicts to perform all the labor within her borders, what kind of a government would it be? It would be a community of a few despotic aristocrats supported and enriched by gangs of chained slaves. Every invoice of goods manufactured by convicts and sold by the State deprives free labor of the opportunity of being employed long enough to perform that labor, and by competition it lowers the wages of those who are employed.

Even from a worldly standpoint, life, reason and morality are above the price of gold. God speed the day when a rich and powerful State shall no longer be guilty of the injustice and barbarity of compelling helpless women and innocent children to suffer, not for a father's crime, for that is unavoidable, but for the punishment of his crime.

F. C. ELDERED.